



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2011

No. 77

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, June 3, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.

## House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2011

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 1, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LYNN A. WESTMORELAND to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT OF 1882

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce an action to address an injustice carried out on this very floor that

Congress has never atoned for, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

A century ago, the Chinese came here in search of a better life; but they faced harsh conditions, particularly in the Halls of Congress. Congress passed numerous laws to restrict Chinese Americans, starting from the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, to stop the Chinese from immigrating, from becoming naturalized citizens, and from ever having the right to vote.

These were the only such laws to target a specific ethnic group. The Chinese were the only residents that had to carry papers on them at all times. They were often harassed and detained. If they couldn't produce the proper documents, authorities threw them into prison or out of the country, regardless of their citizenship status. Political cartoons and hateful banners like these were hung in towns and cities and printed in papers. At that time of this hateful law, the Chinese were called racial slurs, were spat upon in the streets, and even brutally murdered.

Only after China became an ally of the U.S. in World War II was this law repealed in 1943, 60 years after its passage. It has never been formally acknowledged by Congress as incompatible with America's founding principles.

That is why, as the first Chinese American woman elected to Congress, and whose grandfather was a victim of this law, I stand on the very floor where the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed and announce that I have introduced a resolution calling for a formal

acknowledgment and expression of regret for the Chinese exclusion laws.

When the exclusion laws were first introduced, there was a great deal of debate in Congress over their merits. The U.S. had just abolished slavery. The 14th and 15th Amendments had recently been ratified. Slavery had been defeated, and freedom seemed more certain. The national atmosphere led many in Congress to stand up against the discriminatory anti-Chinese laws. But over the years, those standing for justice almost all disappeared. By the time 1882 came around, Members of Congress were fighting over who deserved the most credit for getting the most discriminatory laws passed and standing against the "Mongolian horde."

Representative Albert Shelby Willis from Kentucky pushed relentlessly for the exclusion laws, lambasting the Chinese. Standing in the same spot where I am now, he said the Chinese were "an invading race" and called them "alien with sordid and un-republican habits." He declared the "U.S. was cursed with the evils of Chinese immigration" and that they disturbed the "peace and order of society."

But there were a brave few, a small minority who fought hard against prejudice and principles of freedom. One such man was Senator George Frisbie Hoar, whose statue now stands proudly in the Capitol. He stood up to all of the Chinese exclusion laws and voted against each. He said in 1904 when the laws were made permanent, "I cannot agree with the principle that this legislation or any legislation on the subject

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3809

rests. All races, all colors, all nationalities contain persons entitled to be recognized everywhere as equals of other men. I am bound to record my protest, if I stand alone."

And stand alone he did. The final vote against the Chinese in the Senate was 76-1. What Senator Hoar stood up for is what I am asking Congress to stand up for today: that all people, no matter the color of their skin, or the nation of origin, are the equals of every other man or woman.

America came to be what it is today through immigrants who came from all corners of the world. Chinese immigrants were amongst them. They sought a place to live that was founded upon liberty and equality. They came in search of the American Dream—that if you worked hard, you could build a good life. It is why my grandfather came to the United States.

But when the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed, the truths that this Nation holds as self-evident—that all are endowed with the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—were discounted by the very ones elected to uphold them.

And so for a generation of our ancestors, like my grandfather, who were told for six decades by the U.S. Government that the land of the free wasn't open to them, it is long past time that Congress officially and formally acknowledges these ugly laws that targeted Chinese immigrants, and express sincere regret for these actions.

With my resolution, Congress will acknowledge the injustice of the Chinese Exclusion Act, express regret for the lives it destroyed, and make sure that the prejudice that stained our Nation is never repeated again. And it will demonstrate that today is a different day and that today we stand side by side for a stronger America.

#### AUTHORIZING MORE WARFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week this body passed the National Defense Authorization Act. In doing so, yet again, it put a stamp of approval on a more violent, belligerent, and militaristic defense policy.

While my friends in the majority continue to posture about Federal spending, they are eager to authorize billions and billions on military programs and policies that don't make America safer.

During last week's debate over the Defense bill, they voted down an amendment that would have brought the Department of Defense funding levels down to the same 2008 levels they want to impose on domestic discretionary spending. Obviously, the Republicans believe in a blank check for the Pentagon, but austerity for everyone else.

They rejected my amendment to eliminate the V-22 Osprey, a multibil-

lion-dollar aircraft with a performance and safety record so shoddy that even Dick Cheney tried to eliminate it when he was Secretary of Defense. They also rejected an amendment that would have prohibited the use of funds for permanent bases in Iraq and Afghanistan, despite the fact that an anonymous officer in Afghanistan was quoted in yesterday's Washington Post as saying, "We've become addicted to building." That officer added that supplemental appropriations, with its billions of dollars for construction, "have been like crack cocaine for the military."

It gets worse, Mr. Speaker. The Defense bill includes a radically expanded authorization for the use of military force. It completely undermines the War Powers Act, empowering the President, whichever President, whom ever is in that office, to declare war regardless of whether an attack against the United States is imminent, regardless of whether our national security has been threatened. The language doesn't even specify any geographic limitation.

□ 1010

The Republican majority couldn't even bring themselves to support an amendment that called simply for a plan within 60 days to transfer responsibility for Afghanistan's security to Afghanistan—a plan—so we can begin the process of redevelopment. Just a plan within 60 days. As our distinguished Democratic leader said here on the floor last week when we were debating this, who could be against that?

Well, apparently the overwhelming majority of House Republicans could be against it and are against it and voted against it. Then they topped it off by voting to eliminate the modest public investment in the U.S. Institute of Peace, an institute that carries out real, well-respected, lifesaving work on peaceful conflict resolution around the world.

Last night the majority played a game of chicken with the global financial credibility of the United States, holding a vote on the debt ceiling that was designed to fail.

I challenge them: You want meaningful spending cuts as a condition for a debt ceiling increase? Then stop giving the Pentagon unlimited use of the taxpayers' ATM card. Stop putting the full faith and credit of the United States on the line in order to wage more war.

You believe in fiscal discipline, and you think everything should be on the table? Then let's talk about saving \$10 billion a month by ending the war in Afghanistan, and let's bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan.

#### HONORING JACK SUTHERLIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a constituent of mine

from the 23rd District of California. His name is Mr. Jack Sutherlin.

Mr. Sutherlin, of Santa Maria, California, served honorably in the Coast Guard during World War II. He was stationed off the California coast. Mr. Sutherlin's brave actions on December 25, 1943, resulted in the safe passage of two escort carriers down the Pacific, along the coast, and into San Diego Bay.

I am very proud to represent Mr. Sutherlin, an example to us all for his dedication to our country and for his lifetime of serving our community.

Mr. Speaker, the debt we owe to our Nation's veterans is immeasurable, and Mr. Sutherlin is no exception. In fact, he's an example of those of that Greatest Generation who served nobly during the Second World War. His actions in 1943 leave me humbled and honored by his sacrifices. We can never repay his service, but we can act honorably on his behalf and behave in a way that is indicative of a grateful Nation.

Singling out events like these are important to remind us that acknowledging our veterans' bravery and sacrifice is never done. Despite the decades that have passed, our country remains indebted to the heroic actions of Mr. Sutherlin and his many brothers in arms.

It's also imperative to remember that we are still a Nation at war and that veterans who served decades ago or just months ago or are serving today deserve our support, our appreciation, and our profound gratitude. Mr. Sutherlin waited too long to be officially recognized, and I'm sure he would agree that all veterans deserve timely and genuine acknowledgements of their service.

I am proud of the work my staff completed to assist Mr. Sutherlin achieve a formal recognition from the commandant of the United States Coast Guard. Just a few days ago, the veterans clinic in Santa Maria, California, hosted a reception and a ceremony where the letter of recognition from the commandant was read and where many of the Coast Guard on active duty stationed at Morro Bay, California, were present to see someone of the generation preceding them being acknowledged.

I consider my work on behalf of veterans to be one of my most sacred responsibilities as a Member of Congress. Veterans like Mr. Sutherlin represent the best this country has to offer, and ensuring his work is recognized is of paramount importance. It's an honor to represent a man of such integrity, conviction, and dedication to his country. I'm proud to include his service in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States Congress.

#### MEETING THE NEEDS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, the 2010 census confirmed that Hispanics are a growing part of the American family. There are now more than 50 million Latinos in the United States, accounting for more than half of the Nation's population growth between 2000 and 2010. Today, one in six Americans is Hispanic.

This tremendous growth adds to our country's rich diversity, but it also brings challenges. The number of English language learners in our Nation's schools has increased by 50 percent over the past decade. English learners are found in States with traditionally large Hispanic populations, like Texas and New Mexico, and in States that have experienced a recent influx of immigrants, like Colorado and Indiana. And English learners are found in large numbers in the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico.

How well our schools educate those students will determine the future success of our Nation. And providing a quality education means ensuring that they graduate from high school with proficiency in English. The benefits of learning English are clear for students living in the 50 States where it is difficult to obtain most jobs without being fluent in the language.

But learning English is also vital for students in Puerto Rico. In my life I have visited many countries around the world; and everywhere I have traveled, I have seen young people studying English with passion and determination. Puerto Rico's sons and daughters, particularly as American citizens living in a U.S. territory, simply must be proficient in English to compete effectively in the modern globalized world.

Yet for too many years, some politicians in Puerto Rico sought to limit the teaching of English in our local schools in a misguided effort to influence the debate over Puerto Rico's political status. This cynical approach has harmed our children and our island. Regardless of one's views on Puerto Rico's status, there can be no question that proficiency in English, as well as in Spanish, is in the best interest of Puerto Rico's youth. To deny our children the opportunity to learn English is to deny them the countless opportunities that come with being bilingual.

Accordingly, since arriving in Congress, one of my primary goals has been to improve English language instruction in Puerto Rico schools. That is why I have introduced a bill to raise a cap that restricts the amount of Federal funds the island can receive to strengthen its English language programs. In order to ensure that the children of Puerto Rico have the same opportunities as children in the States, it is imperative that the island be treated fairly when it comes to allocating Federal funding for English language programs.

Moreover, our schools' success in teaching English learners in Puerto Rico and in the States will depend on

the number of well-prepared bilingual teachers available to instruct these students. In Puerto Rico the challenge has been to find enough teachers who are sufficiently proficient in English to effectively teach the language. At the same time, the increased number of English learners in the States has left school districts scrambling to find enough teachers who are fluent in foreign languages, such as Spanish and Mandarin, as well as in English.

In both cases, schools are asking themselves, How can I find an experienced teacher to meet this need? One answer: teacher exchanges.

I recently introduced legislation that would fund teacher exchanges between school districts in different regions of the United States. Under my bill, for example, a teacher in Puerto Rico could improve her English ability by spending a year in the States trading places with a native English-speaking instructor who seeks to improve her Spanish language skills. Through this exchange the teachers and, more importantly, the students in each community would benefit. No wonder that organizations representing English teachers, foreign language instructors, principals, and school boards have all endorsed my bill.

□ 1020

As Congress works to reform the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I urge my colleagues to address the needs of English language learners, whether those students are located in Santa Fe, San Antonio, or San Juan. Our goal should be as simple as it is ambitious: to ensure that every student in our Nation has the opportunity to graduate from high school as a fluent English speaker.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, yesterday the House resoundingly rejected a so-called "clean" increase in the debt limit, as it should have. But different people are going to draw different conclusions from this vote. The Republicans will say this means unlimited spending cuts, that's how we'll balance the budget. And on my side of the aisle, there will be those who say this puts revenues back into play. Actually, both should be right.

There is no way, no way to deal with a \$1.7 trillion deficit—I guess we're down to \$1.4 trillion this year; money is coming in a little better than expected—to deal with that without dealing with both sides of the equation, that is, revenues and cuts in spending.

Now, unfortunately, around here it seems that coming together for the problems of the Nation is somewhat quaint and old fashioned. I've been here long enough to remember when we used to do those things, when we had the surtax on millionaires back when Bush

I was President and brought back some fiscal sanity, before my time when Ronald Reagan raised taxes three times because he realized that supply-side economics didn't work. Well, we're now back to supply-side economics over here. It doesn't work. And more tax cuts, they're proposing more tax cuts in the face of deficit. Absurd.

So how are we going to force that discussion? I believe we need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We actually passed one when I was here in 1995. I voted for it. It failed by one vote in the Senate. Now, just think, had that been in place when, in the last 2 years of the Clinton Presidency, we not only balanced the budget, we began to pay down debt for the first time since 1969. Then came Bush II, and he said we're going to give that money back to the people. And even when we went into deficit, he said, well, we need more tax cuts. That's what we need is more tax cuts, because we're running a deficit now and that's how you deal with deficits is to cut taxes because then people will—whatever. Somehow that creates more money. If we had had the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in place, Bush couldn't have gotten away with that. He couldn't have launched an unnecessary war in Iraq and cut taxes at the same time; the first time our Nation has gone to war while cutting taxes. And he managed to double the debt in 8 short years, ending with the spectacular crash on Wall Street and the TARP bailout, which many forget was the Bush TARP bailout—I voted against that, too—not the Obama bailout; although Obama continued those same Wall Street friendly policies, to his discredit.

And then the Obama stimulus. Forty percent of that was Bush tax cuts. What is it? What is it we don't get that cutting taxes in the way that George Bush wanted to do and did do with trickle-down economics and piling up more debt does not put people back to work? It's not investment. It doesn't generate economic activity and jobs.

The theory is, oh, the rich people have so much money, they'll invest it in meaningful ways. Corporations are sitting on \$2 trillion in cash. Wall Street billionaire hedge fund managers pay a 15 percent rate of tax, half that of an Army captain. Are they investing in a meaningful way to put people back to work? No. They're speculating and driving up the price of gas and screwing the American people and depressing the economy.

It's time to get real around here. I believe a balanced budget amendment would focus the minds and deal with this deficit and debt in a way that is serious, both with dealing with revenues and dealing with spending cuts. I voted against extending all the Bush cuts in December—not just the ones on the rich people, all of them, a little bit of shared sacrifice. That would have cut the deficit in half—by \$5 trillion—over 10 years. Then we wouldn't have

been screaming in January after everybody—many people on that side of the aisle—voted for extending the Bush tax cuts. They were shocked, shocked, shocked that we had a record deficit this year. Huh? You just voted to reduce revenues by \$400 billion and you're shocked that that increased the deficit? And has it been putting people back to work? Not much that I've seen in my district, I'll tell you that.

Then comes the Ryan budget. A serious budget. Destroys Medicare. Ends Medicare as we know it. Cuts Medicaid. Most people just think that's for poor people. Well, actually, most of the money goes to either kids or seniors in nursing homes. So that's going to be kind of a tough one. So, huge, devastating cuts. More tax cuts. More of the joke economic policies. Let's cut taxes and that will help us deal with the deficit. More tax cuts for rich people and big corporations. And he doesn't balance the budget—even under his rosy scenario written by the Heritage Foundation—until 2040. That's a serious attempt at dealing with our debt and deficit? That's the Ryan budget. The Obama budget is even worse. I don't know if it gets there by 2050.

Neither side is dealing seriously with these issues. We need to focus people's minds, and a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is the best way to do that.

#### RAISING THE DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's important to be able to discuss with my colleagues just what we're doing in this House and what is considered important and urgent and what is the impact on what we're doing.

As my friends, the Republicans on the other side of the aisle, are now spending time with the President, I hope they will have visions of President Ronald Reagan, because in 1983 Ronald Reagan begged and asked the Congress at that time to raise the debt limit. This is not a 2011, 21st century phenomenon never to be heard of in the history of this country. Raising the debt limit, my friends, is not evil or sin. It is an actuality that requires us to be responsible adults.

I want you to eye this picture and to continue to keep your eyes on it continuously as I explain to you what we are doing when we ask for the debt limit to be raised.

Does anyone care about our men and women on the front lines? Do we care about their families? Do we care about veterans? Oh, we wave the flag, and many of us emotionally were drawn to commemorate and honor those who had fallen this past Monday. We inter-related with families, some of whom came up to me and asked me why veterans are discriminated against and can't get work or disabled veterans are

chastised by their employer. And I made a commitment to them that we will work to have jobs and end the discrimination, and that the soldiers who are coming back to 10 percent unemployment—do you realize that, that there is a 10 percent unemployment among Iraq and Afghanistan returning soldiers, soldiers who are in their twenties and thirties or maybe forties, soldiers who may be disabled, who may have come back from a catastrophic injury but they want to work and support their families? These very men and women, do you know what the debt limit not being lifted will do?

And so, yes, this was put on the floor of the House to make a mockery and a joke, but I came here to be a serious legislator and I voted "yes" because it was a serious statement on behalf of my constituents and the American people, and I could not, within 24 hours of being around military families, abandon them with the frivolity and the foolishness of putting something up on the floor just to put it in the eye of the President.

Let me tell you why it partly was done as trickery. Listen to the words of a bond dealer: "I didn't even know they had a vote tonight, to be honest with you," a senior government bond strategist at CRT Capital Group in Stamford, Connecticut said. "The only real event that the market is focused on is the point at which they run out of money and have to shut down the government."

Well, let me tell you the reason why this was just a joke, since those of us who voted "yes" didn't take it as a joke. Because the Secretary of the Treasury has extended the time to August 2. But if we do not raise the debt limit, like Ronald Reagan asked and other Republican Presidents asked with no fanfare, let me tell you what will happen to our soldiers. It will be 20 percent unemployment.

What will happen to Medicare? We won't be making it solvent. We'll just end it and implode it like the Ryan budget wants to do. We will eliminate Medicare for disabled persons and children and seniors in nursing homes.

No, we won't have any veterans benefits, but our cities that now are grappling with disaster, that funding will dry up as well. And we are the rainy day umbrella for the American people.

But you know what else? Summer jobs for our young people who are struggling to get themselves back in school in the fall. In the city of Houston, how—I don't know—unthinking can you be when you close down city pools, the meager opportunity for recreation that a child has in the inner city area or maybe a rural area.

□ 1030

Summer pools totally closed down. And parks. So what are they supposed to do besides having one person that can monitor the pool? You just have them running the streets. What sense does that make?

Or the school districts in the State of Texas now losing \$4 billion. HISD, the Houston Independent School District, one of the largest in the Nation, \$200 million, or AISD, \$30 million.

It's time to wake up and understand that we must recognize the responsibility we have, Mr. Speaker. We can end the war in Afghanistan, bring them home from Iraq, and we can do our job and raise the debt ceiling. This is ridiculous, but I'm not going to be part of it.

#### DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Lost in the hyperbolic statements and calls of doom—"if Congress does not raise the current debt ceiling"—is the real problem that our Nation faces: the out-of-control spending that has become epidemic here in Congress. No doubt a technical default in August surely would be problematic. But much worse would be the results if Republicans caved to Democrats and no significant spending reforms are implemented.

Today, my colleagues, 68 cents of every dollar is spent on entitlement programs. By the year 2025, the government will spend 100 percent of every dollar of revenues on entitlements.

The United States is over \$14 trillion in debt, and without spending cuts in the deficit, our national debt will continue to grow. We must begin to rein in spending and bring about the fiscal changes to protect our children from this growing burden of debt.

Mr. Speaker, importantly, markets understand the difference between a technical default in which investors may have to wait a short period of time for an interest payment and an actual default in which a country is unable to repay its debt. If Congress does not act appropriately now, very soon the country will not face merely a technical default, but instead a real default. Then the calls of doom will be appropriate.

Investors have every incentive to want Congress to balance its budget and get its house in order finally. If this means investors will have to wait a few days for an interest payment to be repaid, then so be it. Because fixing the real problem now guarantees to investors that this government can make its payments 10 years from now, a realization that will comfort investors much more than preventing a mild delay—particularly if that mild delay means future delays, future debt limit debates, and future possible defaults.

The best solution, of course, is no default at all, not technical and not actual. Congress must quickly come together and make some tough decisions that will forever affect the future of our country. But we will not be coerced into a position that fuels the spending addiction that has landed us in this situation where we stand today. We will

not succumb to a vote to increase the debt limit if we are not compensated with significant spending cuts.

As our Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has said, "It's true that allowing America to default would be irresponsible, but it would be more irresponsible to raise the debt ceiling without simultaneously taking dramatic steps to reduce spending and reform the budget process" itself. And it can be done.

We can look back to understand what will happen next. Several years back, Russia had a real default, yet within 2 or 3 years they reached all-time low interest rates. Earlier this year, the House passed a budget resolution for fiscal year 2012 which set non-security discretionary spending to below 2008 funding levels. It calls upon repealing the costly and burdensome health care law and envisions reforming some entitlement programs to contain costs and pay down the national debt.

My colleagues across the aisle have criticized portions of this legislation. But the question is asked, where is their alternative? There can be no debate if the other side cannot produce a logical document that seriously sets out to solve our Nation's crisis, the real crisis. Just like the solution to a drug addiction is not to increase one's intake, the solution to our Nation's spending addiction is not to increase one's capacity to continue to accumulate debt.

The time is now for real reform. Only after we have curbed the trillions of dollars of debt that we continue to pile up can we then consider raising the debt limit.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House. Keep them aware of Your presence as they face the tasks of this day that no burden be too heavy, no duty too difficult, and no work too wearisome.

Help them, and indeed help us all, to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they

might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive, eager to work, and ready to serve You, our great Nation, and all our fellow brothers and sisters. May all that is done this day be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIREs led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### RAISING THE DEBT CEILING MEANS SERIOUS CHANGES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 750 days have passed since the Senate passed a budget. Now, liberals in Congress are leading the charge to increase the current debt limit. The Federal Government officially reached its \$14.3 trillion debt limit in May. America's finances are now borrow, tax, and spend—killing jobs.

Congress should not raise the debt limit without making serious changes in the way the Federal Government spends money. Recklessly raising the debt ceiling without exercising fiscal restraint will lead to a lower international credit rating, higher borrowing costs, and an increase in the cost of the Nation's imports.

This is a threat to senior citizens by risking the value of the dollar. It's a threat to young people, saddling them with overwhelming debt.

Washington must change its way, which is now killing jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### A TRIBUTE TO DENISON DOVER GARRETT

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Denison Dover Garrett, a towering giant who has passed away at the age of 97. A lifelong resident of Greenville, North Carolina, we affectionately referred to Mr. Garrett by his initials, D.D.

D.D. Garrett was a man of great courage who led by example. He worked tirelessly to ensure that the African American community had a voice in public policy. Through his work in the AME Zion Church and the Pitt County Branch of the NAACP, D.D. constantly exposed injustice. He insisted that the American Dream must be a reality to every American regardless of their station in life.

As the first African American county commissioner, D.D. led the way in African American political participation in his community. As the founder of a substantial insurance and real estate firm, D.D. was a successful businessman and mentor to many.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this great life. We extend condolences to his wife, Mrs. Clotea Williams Garrett; their sons, D.D., Jr., and Michael; and the entire Greenville community.

Greenville, North Carolina, is a better place to live and work because of the enormous contribution of Denison D. Garrett.

#### CONGRATULATING THE MARIETTA COLLEGE BASEBALL TEAM

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the economy, the national debt, high gas prices, and the need for jobs, those are still the important issues to the people in my district in southeastern Ohio; but today, I rise to congratulate the Marietta College baseball team for winning their record fifth Division III College World Series title yesterday. Our people have something to cheer about.

The Pioneers, led by coach Brian Brewer, won the deciding game in convincing fashion with an 18-5 victory over Chapman University.

The 'Etta Express was led defensively by a strong pitching performance from All-American honorable mention pitcher Austin Blaski. Blaski pitched a nearly perfect six innings, allowing only two hits and one earned run.

On the offensive side, the Pioneers were led by right-fielder Aaron Hopper, who had four hits, four RBIs, and a stolen base. All-American senior center fielder John Snyder added three hits, two runs scored, and an RBI to end his college career.

The Pioneers finished the season with an amazing record of 47 wins and

4 losses on their way to a record fifth national title.

Congratulations to the 'Etta Express.

#### RECOGNIZING MIKE CONNOLLY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mike Connolly, an educator at the Charles E. Shea Senior High School in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, for his leadership in launching the Voters in the Classroom initiative. Voters in the Classroom is a statewide mock election initiative involving nearly 25 percent of public high schools across the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Connolly's Voters in the Classroom initiative is an effective classroom-based program helping to prepare students to be engaged public citizens. Students in the Voters in the Classroom program participate in mock statewide referendums on important topics, establish voting procedures through classroom discussions and assemblies, and staff polling places at their schools.

I recently visited the students and educators at Shea High School and have seen firsthand the importance of this program. Civic education programs like this are key to the success of our democracy because they increase the likelihood that young people will engage in the election process when they become of age.

I congratulate Mike Connolly on this achievement and thank him for his forward-thinking commitment to Rhode Island's students and the preservation of our democracy.

#### DEBT LIMIT VOTE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, since this President has taken office, we have had the failed stimulus, omnibus, TARP II, Government Motors, the government takeover of health care. Well, the buck stops here. Literally, House Republicans refuse to give the spender-in-chief a blank check to pay for his reckless ways.

If the President even wants to think about moving forward with the debt limit increase, he needs to know that Americans want Congress to drastically cut spending.

Across the Nation, people have cut back and stretched their hard-earned dollars in order to make it through these tough times. The government must do the same. We're facing a debt crisis because Washington spends too much and wastes too much.

Raising the debt limit without a deep spending cut amounts to a Barack Obama big-government bailout. Enough is enough. Stop the Obama bailout now.

□ 1210

#### VETERANS' UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I comment on why I am standing next to the brave and the true of our United States military, let me give a message to Syria and express my outrage over the heinous killing of a 13-year-old boy. President Assad should be held accountable now. And the United Nations needs to voice its opposition. As the Secretary of State has indicated, we need to be standing alongside those seeking freedom in Syria.

And to our allies in Bahrain, where our fleet of Navy personnel are, what a disgrace that they have imploded and blown up mosques because they disagree with their particular faith. This is the Arab Spring, but it will end in devastation if we don't stand for truth and human rights and compassion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, as I stand next to the brave men and women, some who have fallen, and those who now still fight, to ask my Republican friends do you understand that there is a 10 percent unemployment among those who are coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan? Yes, troops who are fighting for us and fighting on our behalf. Yet it has been 21 weeks and the Republicans have no jobs agenda. We need jobs. Create jobs! If you believe in these troops, build jobs for the American people.

#### UNFAITHFUL ALLY?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the more we learn about Pakistan, the more they sound like the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries we call allies. First, it was Osama bin Laden, the world's number one outlaw, living comfortably in a mansion in Pakistan for years, but Pakistan claims no knowledge of that.

Now, a reporter in Pakistan, Syed Saleem Shahzad, has been murdered. He has been critical of the Pakistani Government. He reported that the naval base in Karachi that was attacked was done so by al Qaeda members of the Navy of Pakistan. Human Rights Watch says Shahzad was assassinated by members of the Pakistan intelligence agency, who previously had threatened him.

Meanwhile, Pakistan is chumming up to the Chinese. Sounds like Pakistan is playing both sides in the war on terror. Seven in 10 Americans believe we need to stop or decrease foreign aid to Pakistan. We should stop foreign aid to Pakistan until we know whose side they're on. We don't need to pay them to be unfaithful. They will do it for free.

And that's just the way it is.

#### SENIOR SAFETY NET

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, after a lifetime of service to their families and our Nation, America's seniors deserve the security of a basic safety net like Medicare and Social Security. Sadly, the Republican budget that the House approved in April puts fundamental programs at risk. The Republican budget will end guaranteed Medicare coverage for seniors, I state, end guaranteed Medicare coverage for seniors; cut benefits and turn control over to the insurance industry; and double out-of-pocket costs for seniors over the next decade.

From day one, the Republican plan to end Medicare will toss 4 million seniors into the prescription drug doughnut hole. And from day one, seniors across the Nation will have their copays reinstated for their annual wellness visit.

Seniors in my district understand that we must lower the deficit, but it should not be on the backs of the poor or the disadvantaged. But they also know that it is wrong to end Medicare so we can extend the tax breaks for the millionaires and billionaires. Let's work together on a real budget and lower the deficit.

#### ENDEAVOUR AND SENATOBIA MIDDLE SCHOOL

(Mr. NUNNELEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, at 2:35 a.m., *Endeavor* landed safely following its final trip into space. As *Endeavor* retires after its 25th mission, it lives on with a unique legacy: the only space shuttle named by children.

In 1989, Senatobia, Mississippi, Middle School was the national winner in a competition to name a new spacecraft. Their mission? To come up with a name that captured the spirit of America's mission in space.

On May 16, two decades later, as *Endeavor* launched its final mission, those elementary children are now adults, and the spirit and excitement of that final flight was felt most in Senatobia, Mississippi. As the Senatobia-1, a balloon built and flown by students, was launched, it was filled with signatures wishing Congresswoman GIFFORDS a speedy recovery and captured beautiful images of their beloved spaceship as it took to the skies for one last time.

#### ATTEMPTS TO DISTRACT ATTENTION FROM MEDICARE PLAN

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, last night we saw once again a great display of political theater. My friends across the aisle scheduled a vote on raising the

Nation's debt limit, knowing that it would fail. The vote occurred specifically after the stock market closed because they knew the harsh effect that this game could have on the market. This was simply an effort to distract the public away from the disastrous attempt to end Medicare as we know it.

Under their plan, from day one seniors will see an increase in the cost of prescription drugs and preventive health care. They no longer want to discuss the vote they took to end Medicare and force seniors to pay more for less.

We all agree that smart, responsible budget cuts are needed. That is why Democrats and Republicans from the House, the Senate, and the administration are working together on a plan. We should allow the negotiators to continue their work in good faith with open discussions on the future of our economy and how to decrease our deficit.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to play games with the American public. We must focus on creating jobs, jobs, and more jobs, and move our economy forward.

#### ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH TRIBUTE

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former Congressman from Kansas's Third Congressional District who recently passed. Robert F. Ellsworth served Kansas in the United States Congress for three terms during the 1960s. He was a proud Jayhawk, graduating from the University of Kansas, and he served our country admirably in both World War II and the Korean War as an officer in the United States Navy.

He was known as a candid and independent-minded legislator during his tenure in Congress. A personal adviser to President Richard Nixon and a confidant of Kansas Senator Bob Dole, he also served as an ambassador to NATO and as the Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Gerald Ford. After leaving politics, he founded Hamilton BioVentures, a company focusing on investment in emerging life science technologies.

He is survived by his wife, Eleanor; children William and Anne; as well as stepchildren John, Sarah, and William. My heart, and the heart of the Third District, is with him and his family during this difficult time.

#### HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, it's "getting ridiculous." That's what Saipan Chamber of Commerce President Doug Brennan said about the Department of Homeland Security's failure to issue

regulations implementing Federal immigration in the Northern Mariana Islands. And I agree, it is getting ridiculous.

Three years since the law was enacted, 18 months since it took effect, two oversight hearings, letters from congressional leaders, meeting after meeting, and still no regulations. Workers don't know what their status will be 5 months from now. Businesses can't plan for the future. "It's putting the brakes on the economy," the chamber president says. And what does DHS say? The regulations will be released when the regulations are released.

That is no way for a Federal agency to fulfill its responsibilities. We will get to it when we get to it? Federal immigration was supposed to benefit the Marianas, improve the economy. Instead, it's making things worse. As we think about funding Homeland Security today, Homeland Security should be explaining why it isn't doing its job issuing these long-overdue regulations for the Northern Mariana Islands.

#### DEBT LIMIT VOTE AS POLITICAL STUNT

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, last night our Republican colleagues scheduled an empty vote on the debt ceiling, a political stunt with no serious plan. Last week, the majority leader tried to use a natural disaster as political leverage in their ideological fight over the budget. And last month and again today, Republicans propose ending Medicare as we know it to pay for tax giveaways for millionaires and giant oil companies.

I'm holding another town hall meeting tomorrow, telephone town hall, with my constituents to talk about these issues and what our national priorities should be. The Republican extreme ideological war is a disturbing trend, using national emergencies, the full faith and credit of the United States, and our seniors' health care as if they're bargaining chips. The American people and the Missourians I represent deserve better.

It's time to come together like adults to find serious solutions to our complex problems. And it's time to stop threatening Medicare, important institutions, our national credit, and the national commitment to lend a hand to those in need, and especially those suffering through natural disasters. We can solve this without trying to scare markets or scare seniors. Let's get serious about reducing our deficit and growing jobs.

□ 1220

#### BLAME EVERYTHING FOR DEBT

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, listening to some of the Republicans that were speaking here earlier today, they want to blame Medicare, early childhood education, grants to firefighters for the debt that we have when everybody knows that at the end of the Clinton administration, this country was running a surplus.

Then we had Bush tax cuts; that's about a trillion dollars. Then we have a couple wars; that's a trillion dollars. Then there is a collapse on Wall Street under the Bush administration. That's \$2 trillion. That will turn anybody's budget upside down.

But the Republicans want to take it out of Medicare. They want to dismantle Medicare. They have never liked Medicare to begin with because it really works for middle America, for our seniors. We can't let that happen. We cannot allow them to dismantle Medicare just because of these other things. They want to protect millionaires, billionaires and oil companies. We are not going to let them do that.

#### REPUBLICANS HAVE VIVID IMAGINATION

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot in the media about the political tea party. You know, there is another kind of tea party; that's where children play with their imaginary friends.

We saw an example of that kind of imagination last night in this Chamber. We saw Republicans bring a bill to the floor and then vote to defeat it, not to raise the debt ceiling in spite of the fact that they passed a budget that will raise the national debt by \$8 trillion over the next 10 years. They imagine that that \$8 trillion will magically disappear.

Another example of their vivid imagination is believing that the American people will sit back while they end Medicare, turn over seniors' health care to insurance companies and ask them to pay up to 70 percent of the cost of their health care.

This is not an imaginary world. These are real people with real problems, and the American people are not going to sit back while the Republican Party plays with their imaginary friends.

#### JOBS WITHOUT CREDIT CHECKS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the New York Times editorially commended bills that give people an opportunity to get jobs without having credit checks run on them. In this country today, credit checks are run on almost 65 percent of all job applicants, and sometimes they are used to deny people jobs.

The fact is, even the industry lobbyist said in Oregon last year that credit checks have no correlation to fraud in the workplace or a person's ability to perform a job. Yet because of the credit industry, credit checks are still required.

We have a bill in Congress, the Equal Employment for All bill, that would outlaw such a practice. Five States have outlawed such a practice and 20 States are considering it. We need to create jobs and give everybody a chance. Many people have bad credit because of this economy, because of the recession, because of health care costs that almost forced them into bankruptcy or have, or divorces. They should not be denied the chance to have a job, a second chance.

We should pass the Equal Employment for All bill and give all Americans a chance for employment.

#### AMERICANS AT RISK

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Americans are at risk. They are at risk of having their homes and their businesses demolished, of being injured and even killed, either by a natural disaster such as the tornados that have hit us recently or through a terrorist attack that will more likely come from within the United States.

This is not the time to cut the Homeland Security budget, and that's why today I propose taking military aid to Afghanistan and redirecting it to better equip and to hire more firefighters, more police officers, more emergency medical providers. State and local governments don't have the money to provide these resources because our home values have plummeted due to the foreclosure crisis, which this Congress has failed to address effectively.

There is one responsibility, though, that this Congress must honor, our duty to protect the American people. We, who live in this country, deserve to be safe.

Restore the cuts to the Homeland Security budget, and redirect the money from Afghanistan to protect Americans.

#### CONDEMNING GOVERNMENT OF VIETNAM

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn, yes, condemn, the Government of Vietnam for continuing its appalling human rights record by conducting unjust trials, sham trials of seven citizens who asked for land reform.

This past week, the people's court of Ben Tre unfairly convicted seven land

rights activists to years of imprisonment and probation.

Ms. Tran Thi Thuy was sentenced to 8 years, Pastor Duong Kim Khai was imprisoned for 6 years, and Mr. Pham Van Thong received a 7-year sentence simply for asking for their land back from the Communist Government of Vietnam. This recent trial was no different than Vietnam's past trials where there is no due process.

I hope that my colleagues will look at the record of human rights with respect to Vietnam and join me in urging the Government of Vietnam to drop these false charges.

#### COMMENDING MINNEAPOLIS EMERGENCY RESPONDERS

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I represent Minneapolis, Minnesota. Recently, my district was hit by a tornado. That tornado caused damage to well over 535 houses and took the lives of two of my constituents.

I just want to commend all those people who stepped forward to do the right thing for the people who were victims. Whether you were serving meals for people who were put out of their homes; whether you were making games for the children of the displaced to be able to have some joy in their lives after such a difficult period; or whether you were an emergency responder, police, fire, emergency, medical; or whether you were a member of our local government, I want everyone in my district to know, everyone in the Fifth Congressional District to know, that I am so proud of the work that you did.

I want folks to know that it is times of crisis like this tornado in which the best of us comes out, when we find our charitable spirit, when we find our courage, when we find all those things that sometimes are lacking in everyday life. I want to let you know that on the faces of the children who have had a warm place to stay after their own homes were knocked to the ground and trees went through people's roofs, that I want to thank all those first responders, all those public servants, all those volunteers who stepped up and made a very difficult situation just a little bit better for everyone who was involved.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we could never forget those two citizens who lost their lives when they were hit by this tornado. It was a tragedy for them and their families, and we will keep them in our thoughts and in our hearts and in our minds as we move forward.

#### DEBT RESOLUTION

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, the partisan debt resolution was dead on ar-

rival yesterday. But what really should have been DOA is the Republican plan to end Medicare and turn seniors over to private insurance companies.

Today, despite the outright rejection of this plan from south Florida to western New York and all across America, Republicans will try to deem and pass the reckless Ryan budget. That's right: those who decried "deem and pass" during the health care reform debate now seek to use it to end Medicare.

In fact, it was the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee who, in an effort to stoke fear over the Affordable Care Act, derisively labeled deem and pass the Slaughter Solution. Apparently using deem and pass to help insure 150 million Americans is an abomination but using it to end Medicare, that's courageous.

What would truly be courageous is if my Republican colleagues abandoned their plan to gut Medicare and Medicaid and instead supported deficit reduction that ends giveaways to Big Oil and more \$100,000 tax cuts for millionaires.

□ 1230

#### RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Last night's vote on raising the debt ceiling is further proof that the Republican majority plans to hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage while they demand as ransom extreme cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

News flash: The American people simply won't sacrifice Medicare and Medicaid and the guaranteed benefits they provide.

Seniors across the country are speaking out: Hands off Medicare, and, Don't slash Medicaid's health and long-term care benefits to pay for tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, Big Oil and companies that offshore jobs.

Unlike the Republicans, Democrats are serious about responsible and real deficit reduction.

The Republican plan actually increases unemployment and the deficits, ends Medicare, further erodes our middle class and hurts poor children, all to increase the fortunes of oil companies, millionaires and billionaires. This is a plan that goes against the majority of Americans, and we won't have it.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1017, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 287 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 287

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the

House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for section 536. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 34, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect (with the modification specified in subsection (c)) in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution. The allocations printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012.

(b) The chair of the Committee on the Budget shall adjust the allocations referred to in subsection (a) to accommodate the enactment of general or continuing appropriation Acts for fiscal year 2011 after the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 34 but before the adoption of this resolution.

(c) For provisions making appropriations for fiscal year 2011, section 3(c) of House Resolution 5 shall have force and effect through September 30, 2011.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 287 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for unfunded mandates, although there are likely some in the underlying bill, H.R. 2017, because the bill slashes funding for our State and local governments as they prepare against homeland security threats and respond to natural disasters.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. ELLISON. Before I begin, Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ELLISON. The rule states, "House Concurrent Resolution 34, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution."

Does this mean that the rule deems that the Senate will have passed H. Con. Res. 34?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The content of the rule will be subject to debate.

Mr. ELLISON. I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the inquiry.

Mr. ELLISON. So voting "yes" on the rule is voting "yes" for H. Con. Res. 34, the Ryan budget, which ends Medicare; is that right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is making a point for debate.

Mr. ELLISON. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the inquiry.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the Ryan budget end Medicare as we know it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I raise this point of order because I think it's important to discover whether or not the underlying rule for the Homeland Security appropriations bill also deems the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it. It's the only vehicle we've got to actually talk about this rule and this bill and how we are being denied the ability to actually offer amendments that we would like to, to illuminate what's actually happening in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to address our deficit. But cutting the lifeline for our seniors is not an act of courage; it's actually cowardly. Claiming to reduce the budget deficit on the backs of Americans who have paid into their retirement their entire lives not only harms American seniors but goes against the basic values of fairness and security that Americans cherish.

Medicare guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who

pay into it their whole lives. It represents the basic American values of fairness and respect for those seniors which Americans cherish. Siding with lobbyists to give insurance company bureaucrats control of Medicare does nothing to address the deficit, but it does a great deal to reduce health care for our seniors.

Let's put America back to work, and let's reject the rule and underlying bill by voting "no" on this motion to consider.

I now yield 2 minutes to Mr. CICILLINE of the great State of Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this rule which allows for debate on the fiscal year 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill.

This bill makes dangerous cuts to the Urban Areas Security Initiative, or UASI, a program critical to the security of our country's urban areas that have been deemed at high risk of terrorist attacks. One of those urban areas is Providence, Rhode Island, in my congressional district, along with many other communities.

Just last year, the greater Providence area was one of 64 cities that was identified either because of their capital or their critical assets or their geography as being areas at most risk of being targeted by terrorists.

As a result of those designations, Providence has been receiving critical funding from the Federal Government under the UASI program to support efforts to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and other emergencies. And Providence, under the leadership of Colonel Pete Gaynor, became the first city in America to have an accredited Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security. However, the funding cuts to UASI that are contained in this bill will cripple the ability of key urban areas like Providence to effectively ensure public safety should a terrorist attack occur.

□ 1240

How?

The loss of funds will limit the ability of Providence and other communities to address cyber-terrorism and to communicate with first responders in an emergency, among many other critical emergency functions.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's defense must come first. We cannot in good conscience spend billions of dollars protecting people all over the world at the expense of our own national security. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of restoring funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative and against this rule.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Will the assault on the well-being and the health care of America never

end? Look over the last 5 months as to what has happened here. This bill takes it one more step.

First is the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act with provisions in it to protect Americans from the rapacious appetite of the health insurance companies. Providing protections, Republicans would repeal that. Then the next step, which we saw just recently in the Republican budget, is the termination of Medicare for those who are under 55 years of age. What are they to do? Then, for those who are already on Medicare, there will be a significant, serious reduction in the Medicaid program, which provides essential funding for those seniors in nursing homes.

Will the assault never end?

Here in this bill, to protect the American homeland is a deeming of the Republican budget, which clearly terminates Medicare. Is it never going to end? Are we never going to step forward to actually put in place legislation that will assist Americans in getting the health care that they need?

Step one, way back: Repeal the Affordable Health Care Act. Give limitless opportunities to the insurance companies to go after the men and women of this Nation—terminating Medicare. Here, coming back in a Homeland Security bill, slipping in by sleight of hand a repeal, once again, of health care.

By the way, how is it going to be paid for? You're going to take it out of seniors' pockets, but you're not going to go after the oil companies? Come on now. The oil companies, the richest industry in the world, not paying their fair share and at the same time getting subsidies from the American taxpayers?

It is time for that to end. There are ways to pay for the deficit and to bring it down. One of the ways not to do it is to go after seniors.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on our side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is: Should the House now consider House Resolution 287?

While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order. The waiver is prophylactic in nature. Specifically, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act nor has the Congressional Budget Office notified the Rules Committee of any violation of the act. Additionally, the open rule before the House today allows any Member of Congress to amend or strike any provision of the bill, which is the ultimate failsafe.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the

day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. There is a lot of talk and legalese about what is going on today, but the reality is what the Republicans are trying to do underneath all of that legalese language is to enshrine in law the Republican Ryan budget. By voting for the rule, what you do is to put into force that budget.

What does that budget do? It ends Medicare.

Now, there are people who resent that term—that oh, no, we're really going to save it. Well, I'm going to tell you, when you take away the guaranteed benefits of Medicare—that's what seniors get right now—for people 55 and under, they are thrown into the not-so-loving arms of the insurance companies, and their costs will increase out of their own pockets by about \$6,000. That's what the bill does.

The bill also turns Medicaid upside down, which is not only the health care plan for poor children in the United States but also the largest payer for nursing homes and home health care. That is the single biggest part of Medicaid—paying for nursing home care and home health care. So it's another slap at the seniors.

The other thing that the legislation does is to offer more tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. It lowers the tax rates for corporation, many of which aren't even paying any taxes right now, a couple of which got tax refunds from the government. You've got major companies paying fewer taxes than ordinary Americans. That's what this does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the lady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The American people aren't stupid. They will understand that this is another doubling down on cutting Medicare. It will be apparent by the end of this day.

Mr. REED. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, we should be creating jobs, not destroying Medicare. We should be preserving what has made America great, which is the basic sense that we are all in this thing together.

Yes, it is absolutely true that people should go out into the private sector and try their luck in the free market—skill, ingenuity and all that—but America has always had a strong public sector, which has been essential to the survival and the success of that private sector: fair rules, good infrastructure, good jobs, times in America, like during the Depression, when Eisenhower led us to build and create that infrastructure. Then in 1968, when we created Medicare, this country has

been at its best. Yes, a private sector but also a strong, vibrant public sector.

We are at a point in American history today when at least the Republican caucus believes we don't need a public sector. We just don't need one. We may need one, maybe, for military stuff, but beyond that, they just don't see a purpose for it. I believe Americans think that things like Medicare, infrastructure development, Social Security, and things like the GI Bill are important parts of what make America "America" because they are how we recognize as Americans that we are all in this thing together, that our senior citizens will not be abandoned, that our GIs coming back will not be left behind, that communities which need police, fire and EMT services will not just be left to the ravages of others.

We need an American commitment to Social Security and Medicare, and that's what we're going to be arguing for today. The American people can count on the Democratic Caucus to never abandon our seniors even as Republicans want to take Medicare apart as a program that has served so many people so well. You want to do something to change Medicare? Why don't we let Medicare negotiate drug prices. That could probably save us several billion dollars a year, as much as \$53 billion a year. Republicans don't want to do that because they've got their interests to protect.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I will note that each of the comments that have been offered from the other side are not relevant to the point of order.

Yet, in response to the comments that have been tendered by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, I would say that Republicans are not here to destroy Medicare. They are here to save Medicare.

We have put forth a responsible plan that has been openly and continuously debated in the public forum and in this Chamber about how we're going to move forward with the problem that we have in Medicare. It is a problem we cannot deny. Both sides of the aisle know that Medicare is on a path to bankruptcy. We have put forth a plan. We have put forth a plan that guarantees that we can deal with the problem in such a way that those who are on Medicare are not impacted and that those within a generation of retiring into Medicare are not impacted. Yet we're villainized by the other side for allegedly throwing grandma off the cliff—for taking away Medicare.

□ 1250

That is not being honest with the American public. We will be honest with the American public. We recognize the problem in Medicare. We put forth a plan. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not put forth a plan to deal with the problem. They want to engage in electioneering, politicking, and looking at the reelection efforts for 2012.

Well, we are here as members of this caucus and as Members of this body to deal with the problems of America in an honest and open fashion, and that is what we will do.

The House-passed budget guarantees that seniors will have coverage that is affordable. The House-passed budget guarantees seniors will be able to find a plan. It does not end Medicare as we know it. It does not throw our seniors off the cliff. It is a responsible plan that leads us to a situation that deals with the problem of Medicare that is a known problem. If we want to continue to live in denial and not be honest with the American public, then I tell the American people: follow the Democratic proposal of engaging in name-calling rather than sitting down and engaging in problem-solving. That's what we're about.

At this point in time, I urge my colleagues to continue the consideration of the underlying rule and reject this point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 183, not voting 14, as follows:

## [Roll No. 380]

## YEAS—234

Adams	Cravaack	Hall
Aderholt	Crawford	Hanna
Akin	Crenshaw	Harper
Alexander	Culberson	Harris
Amash	Davis (KY)	Hartzler
Austria	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Dent	Hayworth
Bachus	DesJarlais	Heck
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Bartlett	Dold	Henger
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Herrera Beutler
Bass (NH)	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Benishkek	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga (MI)
Berg	Ellmers	Hultgren
Biggert	Emerson	Hunter
Billray	Farenthold	Hurt
Bilirakis	Fincher	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Black	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Bonner	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Bono Mack	Flores	Jones
Boustany	Forbes	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Kelly
Brooks	Fox	King (IA)
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Buoshon	Galleghy	Kinzinger (IL)
Buerkle	Gardner	Kline
Burgess	Garrett	Labrador
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Lamborn
Calvert	Gibbs	Lance
Camp	Gibson	Landry
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Lankford
Canseco	Goodlatte	Latham
Cantor	Gosar	LaTourette
Capito	Gowdy	Latta
Carter	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Cassidy	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Long
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Coble	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Coffman (CO)	Grimm	Lungren, Daniel
Cole	Guinta	E.
Conaway	Guthrie	Mack

Manzullo	Posey	Shuster
Marchant	Price (GA)	Simpson
Marino	Quayle	Smith (NE)
McCarthy (CA)	Reed	Smith (NJ)
McCaul	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
McClintock	Reichert	Southerland
McCotter	Renacci	Stearns
McHenry	Ribble	Stivers
McKeon	Rigell	Stutzman
McKinley	Rivera	Sullivan
McMorris	Roby	Terry
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Tipton
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Turner
Miller, Gary	Rokita	Upton
Mulvaney	Rooney	Walberg
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Neugebauer	Roskam	Walsh (IL)
Noem	Ross (FL)	Webster
Nugent	Royce	West
Nunes	Runyan	Westmoreland
Nunnelee	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
Palazzo	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Paul	Schilling	Wittman
Paulsen	Schmidt	Wolf
Pearce	Schock	Womack
Pence	Schweikert	Woodall
Petri	Scott (SC)	Yoder
Pitts	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Poe (TX)	Sessions	Young (IN)
Pompeo	Shimkus	

## NAYS—183

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Altmire	Fudge	Neal
Andrews	Garamendi	Oliver
Baca	Green, Al	Owens
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pallone
Barrow	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Payne
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Berman	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hinchee	Pingree (ME)
Boren	Hinojosa	Polis
Boswell	Hirono	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Holden	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Holt	Rahall
Butterfield	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Reyes
Capuano	Inslee	Richardson
Cardoza	Israel	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Keating	T.
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kissell	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cooper	Levin	Sewell
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Costello	Lipinski	Shuler
Courtney	Loebsack	Sires
Critz	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Crowley	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lujan	Speier
Cummings	Lynch	Stark
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matsui	Tonko
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Deutch	McCollum	Tsongas
Dicks	McDermott	Van Hollen
Dingell	McGovern	Velázquez
Doggett	McIntyre	Visclosky
Donnelly (IN)	McNerney	Watt
Doyle	Meeks	Waxman
Edwards	Michaud	Weiner
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Welch
Engel	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Eshoo	Moore	Woolsey
Farr	Moran	Wu
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Filner	Nadler	

## NOT VOTING—14

Braley (IA)	Lucas	Tierney
Duffy	Myrick	Walz (MN)
Giffords	Olson	Wasserman
Gohmert	Richmond	Schultz
Gonzalez	Schwartz	Waters

□ 1316

Mr. REICHERT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. House Resolution 287 provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 287, to provide the rule for H.R. 2017, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012. I am proud to be managing this rule, the first truly open rule since July 31, 2007, an Agriculture appropriations bill in the 110th Congress. The 112th Congress has made it clear that it supports an open process, and this rule exemplifies this initiative. For 119 Members of the 112th Congress, this is their first experience with an open rule, including six members of the Rules Committee. I am proud to be part of this body and this conference that is engaged in this transparency in government and this open process. Throughout the entire 111th Congress, only 810 amendments were considered. Only 6 months into this, the 112th Congress, 437 amendments have been considered.

The leadership of this Congress is directly listening to the American people and their call for an open and transparent process. In addition, this bill also follows the promise that we have made to the American people in that it does not include any earmarks either in the underlying bill or in the conference report. This commitment is what Americans desire and deserve, and this will continue the process in this Congress that we have committed ourselves to the American people to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this rule before the House drastically short-change Homeland Security priorities,

but this rule puts into force by deeming and passing the Republican budget resolution.

This rule, section 2, states very clearly that the Republican budget resolution shall have force and effect. That is the traditional language of a deem and pass. Yes, this budget deems passed the elimination of Medicare in order to keep in place tax cuts for the highest earners and tax breaks for oil.

□ 1320

And while I do thank the majority for offering up the first open rule during my tenure in the House, I ask at what price. Well, I think there would be broad bipartisan support for an open rule. I, for one, cannot support a rule that deems passed the elimination of Medicare. Americans resoundingly opposed the approach of dismantling Medicare. They want us to put our economy on more secure fiscal footing and do it while strengthening our economy, creating jobs and mending, not ending, Medicare.

I would like to quote former Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER in reference to the approach of "deem and pass" that was considered by the then-majority Democrats with regard to the health care bill. Then-Minority Leader BOEHNER said, "This legislative trick has been around for a long time, but it's never been used for a bill so controversial and so massive in scope."

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I will not yield.

What could be more massive than an elimination of Medicare contained in a rule rather than approach a simple vote on appropriations with regard to Medicare, cutting Medicare, bills with regard to Medicare reform?

This is the most sweeping rule that I've certainly ever faced in my time in the House of Representatives, and I think many of my colleagues agree.

The passage of this rule alone would simply end Medicare as we know it by construing in the deem and pass of the bill itself the operative language. And let me explain how this works for some of our colleagues.

Rules have broad authority. And I know the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, will on his own time be able to talk of it. The Rules Committee, by the good graces of the House with our rules passing the House, has the ability to accomplish whatever the House allows us to through a rule.

So in this rule, the House will deem under section 2 that the Ryan budget, the budget that ends Medicare, the Republican budget, shall have force and effect until a conference report passes and that will likely not occur unless the Republicans alter their negotiating position vis-à-vis the Senate and vis-à-vis the President.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on eliminating Medicare contained in section 2 of this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I'm particularly glad that you're in the chair because it was a speech that you delivered last September in which you said that we were going to, in fact, if we won the majority, put into place an entire new structure that we had seen under neither political party over the preceding years, that is, the kind of openness, transparency, and accountability that the American people have said overwhelmingly that they want.

And so, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to you personally how much I appreciate the stellar leadership that you've provided us on this very important issue.

It is extraordinarily ironic that we last night saw the minority members of the Rules Committee actually vote "no" on the first open rule to be considered here in the House of Representatives. And yet over the past several months, they've been offering amendment after amendment in the Rules Committee calling for open rules. And so we report one out, and they vote "no."

Now, the other thing that I think is very important for us to recognize is that we have important challenges that are ahead of us as it relates to Homeland Security. My colleague managing this rule who, by the way, is one of the two floor managers, neither of whom has been able to see an open rule in the House of Representatives up to this moment, my friend didn't even mention the very important underlying legislation that is before us.

The distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend, Mr. ROGERS, is here. He and Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PRICE, and others on that subcommittee have worked very hard to deal with this priority item. Mr. ROGERS had served in the leadership on this subcommittee in the past and continues to have a great interest in it.

And we should note that as we look at this new procedure that hasn't been considered since, as my friend from Corning said, July 31 of 2007, what we have is a structure whereby Members will have the opportunity to stand up and offer amendments.

And I listened to my friend from Providence, our new colleague, Mr. CICILLINE, who said that he opposes this bill because of the fact that it makes a cut that he didn't like. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, under this rule Mr. CICILLINE or any other Member of this House will be able to stand up and if they can find offsets, they can have a vote on the amendment addressing their particular priority.

I also have to say that in the Rules Committee our good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) was before us talking about his concerns. And he asked for a waiver from the Rules Committee, nearly unprecedented, that would have gone beyond the standard definition of an open rule and provided him extraordinary protection for a priority which he thinks needs to be addressed. Well, Mr. Speaker, under this open amendment process, Mr. PRICE will again be able to offer an amendment that he will be able to, if he can find an offset, have a vote on here in the House.

Now I want to talk about this issue that my friend from Boulder addressed just a few moments ago and that we continue to hear over and over and over again. This so-called "deem and pass." This is not, Mr. Speaker, a deem-and-pass provision. I will remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle we have already passed, with a very rigorous debate here on the House floor, the budget. We've passed it already.

Now, so that we are able to move ahead with the important appropriations work with the 302 allocations that need to be done, it is essential that we deem this budget because we have yet to have a conference report. We've yet to see our friends in the other body pass out a budget. And so it is essential that we deem, which has been done since virtually the beginning of time, to make sure that we can proceed with our very important work.

Tough decisions need to be made. Under the leadership of Speaker BOEHNER, we are poised to make those tough decisions. Mr. Speaker, it's important that we have a strong, bipartisan vote for the first of what will be more and more open rules in the 112th Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this.

I look forward to sitting where Speaker BOEHNER is right now to preside over the first appropriation bill that will be considered under an open amendment process, and I look forward to a very rigorous debate.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Of course while the underlying merits of the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill are critical, and if the rule passes they'll be debated under the underlying rule, eliminating Medicare as we know it is even more important to the American people. Hence the discussion under this rule as well.

I should point out that while this is an open rule, again as a member of the minority I'm deeply appreciative for the chance to amend the provisions of the Department of Homeland Security bill. If this rule passes, it will be too late to save Medicare under the bill. The very passage of this rule itself will deem passed the budget that contains the elimination of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. This is indeed an open rule in the sense it's so open that if you vote for the rule, you're voting to end Medicare.

Republicans have done this once. If you vote for this, you're going to do it twice. And the gentleman who is handling this for the majority earlier talked about Medicare and said the Republicans are trying to save it. You don't save something by ending it. Purely and simply. And to come to this floor and say you're saving it when you're ending it, that kind of talk is a big lie.

We heard this with Social Security some years ago when the effort to privatize it was said to be an effort to save it. The public caught on. And the public said no. The public has now said "no" to ending Medicare. But, essentially, you're tone deaf.

Now, you're doubling down on your plan to end it, a plan that would force seniors to pay twice as much for their health care, a plan that increases seniors' drug costs, and a plan that puts insurance companies in charge of seniors' health care.

□ 1330

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I will finish.

So instead of a bipartisan effort to save it, by this rule you are essentially deeming the budget that you passed that ended Medicare, period.

So don't come and say you're saviors when you're eliminating a program. Stand up and be honest and say you want to replace it with something else. That something else is not Medicare. It's turning it over to the private insurance industry and saying to seniors who become eligible, who would be, instead, you are going to see double your costs. That's not forthright.

If you vote "yes" on the rule, you are the second time voting to end Medicare.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind Members that their remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from New York, I would just like to make it clear that in our House-passed budget, on page 58, lines 8 and 9, it is clearly articulated there that current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement without changes.

I would also note for the record, to clarify and make sure the record is very clear, that the budget that we are talking about is not going to be presented to the President and enacted into law. What we are talking about here is nothing about ending Medicare as we know it.

At this point in time, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the chairman, Mr. KING from New York.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At the outset, let me say I am proud to vote for this rule because it is an open rule, and I commend the Speaker for doing this. It's really an important step forward, I believe, in the history of this House.

Let me say also that, very reluctantly, in its current form, I will have to vote against final passage of this bill. I say this because we are at a stage now where the threat level, the homeland security threat level is the highest it's been since September 11. The killing of bin Laden has only made that worse. We know also from bin Laden's own records that he is aiming at maritime, he is aiming at mass transit, and he is aiming at our major cities. Yet we are cutting each of those programs by 50 percent, a fifty percent cut.

Now, I can speak for New York in that I can tell you we have a thousand police officers. We have a Lower Manhattan security initiative. We have radiation detection. I can go through a whole list of programs. Every dollar in those programs can be accounted for. And I just cannot see why, at a time when the threat level is the highest it's been since September 11, that we are reducing Homeland Security grants by 50 percent.

The Department was set up in the aftermath of September 11 to fight terror, yet those grants are being reduced. And I know there is anecdotal evidence that this program isn't working, that isn't working. I would say specify what's not working, but don't take a meat axe. Don't cut across the board the way it's being done here. We're talking about human life. We're talking about just a terrible threat to our cities, terrible threat to our ports, terrible threat to mass transit.

And for those—and I understand the need to cut. I understand that need tremendously. Having said that, even from my strictly budgetary point of view, you have one dirty bomb go off in one subway in Boston, New York, or Chicago, and apart from the tragic loss of human life, apart from the tragic loss of human life there will be incalculable economic devastation, which will also cost billions and billions of dollars of lost revenue and jobs and have a terrible impact.

I lived through September 11. I know what it did to New York. I know the impact it had then. I don't want any other city, any other area in the country to go through that again. And yet we're reducing our defenses at a time when they are most needed.

So with that, I would just ask all the Members to give Chairman ROGERS the credit, give Chairman ADERHOLT the credit, but unfortunately I have to vote against this.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again, while the majority is claiming this to be an open rule, the very passage of the rule itself deems passed the Republican budget that ends Medicare. That will not be amendable in any way, shape, or form in the general debate. All that

will be amendable are provisions relating to the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an ordinary House rule we will be voting on today. The resolution deems the provisions of the Republican budget to have "full force and effect." In other words, a vote on the rule today is essentially another vote on the Republican budget plan that protects subsidies for the Big Oil companies, while ending the Medicare guarantee and slashing investments in education. Those wrong-headed priorities were thoroughly rejected in the recent special election in New York.

The American people clearly oppose a one-sided plan that would immediately reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole and tells seniors that in 10 years they will pay \$9,000 more for their current set of benefits or take deep cuts in those benefits.

Ladies and gentlemen, the median income of seniors on Medicare is less than \$21,000 a year. What kind of budget says we're going to require seniors with median incomes of \$21,000 a year to pay \$9,000 more in just 10 years while cutting the rate for millionaires, the top marginal tax rate for millionaires by 30 percent? What kind of budget would do it? Well, the budget that was passed by the Republicans a few months ago and the one they're doubling down on today.

We have to have a balanced budget plan. We have to have a plan that addresses this from all aspects, not a plan that the former Speaker of the House described as a radical plan that was driven by right-wing social engineering.

It is very ironic that on the very day we will be swearing in the next Member of Congress from New York's 26th District that we will be voting again on a budget that the people of that district, like people around the country, rejected because—the former Speaker of the House had it right—it was radical and right wing and not the right plan for America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

The question we're facing here is what is the best way forward. We all understand we have to have a budget deficit plan that's predictable and addresses that issue, but why in the world would we adopt a one-sided approach that has those priorities, that says we're going to slash Medicare and give tax cuts for the wealthy?

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that the budget

that they so referenced went through an open process. It was subject to debate. It was amended in this Chamber and passed by this body. And if they are so disinclined to approve that budget or stand with that budget, I would ask them to reach out to their colleagues in the opposing Chamber over in the Senate who have not passed a budget for the last 762 days and take the matter up with them.

At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand why this might be confusing to my friends on the other side of the aisle. After all, they didn't bother to pass a budget last year. Our friends on the other side of the Rotunda in the Senate didn't bother to pass a budget this year. We have a budget crisis. We've got a \$1.5 trillion deficit. We've got a debt that is getting out of our control. And what do you do when you have a problem like that? You pass a budget.

The reason we're doing what we're doing today is because our partners on the other side of the Rotunda in the Senate didn't pass a budget. House Republicans did. We passed a budget. And we're acknowledging and living within that budget. If our friends on the other side of the aisle bothered to pass a budget, we wouldn't be in the situation where we are today.

Now, let's discuss about what our budget does and what it does not do. Number one, because we have a debt crisis, we think we have a moral obligation to our constituents, our children, and our grandchildren to put our budget on a path to balance and to pay off our national debt. We also think we need to put our economy on a path to prosperity so we can get job creation.

Let's, for a moment, talk about Medicare. Medicare as we know it is already gone. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, when they passed the Affordable Care Act, they stopped the Medicare status quo. Under the President's new health care law, that ends Medicare as we know it. It does two things: It raids Medicare, and it rations Medicare. It takes \$500 billion from Medicare to spend on the President's new health care law. It doesn't take that money to extend its solvency.

Just like people have complained for years we're raiding the Social Security trust fund and we should stop doing that, the President's health care law does that to Medicare now.

□ 1340

The second thing it does, starting next year, the President will appoint 15 unelectable, unaccountable bureaucrats to put in charge of Medicare, to price control and to ration Medicare for current seniors. What's worse is the President and the Senate still have yet to put out a plan to save Medicare to prevent it from going bankrupt.

We stop the raid of Medicare in our budget and make sure that half a trillion dollars stays in Medicare to advance its solvency.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will not yield.

Number two, we repeal the rationing board so that we don't put bureaucrats in charge of determining what kind of health care benefits seniors do or do not get; and, number 3, we save Medicare.

The way in which we do this is this. We say that if you are on Medicare, if you are 10 years away from retiring at 55 and above, government already made a promise to you. We want government to keep that promise.

So under our budget we keep that promise. We stop the raid, we repeal the rationing board. And for those of us who are 54 and below, who have a bankrupt system that we right now cannot count on, we reform it so that it works like the system Members of Congress and Federal employees have. It's a system that looks like Medicare Advantage or the drug benefit that works today, where seniors get a choice of plans offered to them by Medicare, guaranteed coverage options from which they can choose, and Medicare subsidizes that plan. It doesn't subsidize people as much if they are wealthy, and it subsidizes them a lot more if they are low income, if they are sick.

This saves Medicare. This puts Medicare on a path to solvency and, more importantly, by saving it for future generations we can keep the promise to the current generation. We repeal the rationing board, we stop the raid, and we save the program.

That's what our budget proposed to do, but with respect to this rule, we are talking about discretionary spending. We are talking about paying the bills this year for all those different government agencies.

We simply think Congress should function the way the Founders envisioned it where we actually pass budgets, we actually scrutinize spending, and we actually finance government's functions and its agencies. We are not dunking our responsibility; we are passing our budgets. Because we are deeming those numbers in this year's bill, it is simply because of the fact that nobody else around here seems to be bothered with passing budgets.

The President hasn't put out a plan to fix the problem and the Senate has, for a second year in a row, failed to even pass a budget. We are leading, we are saving Medicare, we are getting the debt under control, and we are working to create jobs in this economy and we are governing by actually paying the bills and passing our appropriation bills.

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to sections 301 of H. Con. Res. 34, the House-passed budget resolu-

tion for fiscal year 2012, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations set forth pursuant to the budget for fiscal year 2012. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays reported by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, which are designated for the Global War on Terrorism. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised allocations are to be considered as allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34.

PAUL RYAN,

*Chairman, House Budget Committee.*

#### ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

2012		
Discretionary Action .....	BA	1,019,402
	OT	1,224,119
Adjustment for Global War on Terrorism .....	BA	258
Reported by Subcommittee on Homeland Security .....	OT	206
Total Discretionary Action .....	BA	1,019,660
	OT	1,224,325
Current Law Mandatory .....	BA	745,700
	OT	734,871

Mr. POLIS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

I rise in opposition to this Republican attempt to deem their budget passed, just deem it passed so that we can begin with this process. It's just wrong. It's not the way we should be conducting business, but it's the way they have been operating all year.

Recently, radio evangelist Harold Camping calculated that the world would end at precisely 6 p.m. on May 21. Well, he was wrong. But much like Harold Camping's wildly inaccurate predictions, the House Republicans have come up with their own apocalyptic vision, the Republican Rapture. This budget decides who gets lifted up into the economic stratosphere and who gets left behind.

Under this scheme, if you are a millionaire or a billionaire, you get raptured into heaven with all of your tax breaks remaining intact. But if you are Grandma and Grandpa, and you are dependent upon Medicare in order to take care of your health care needs, you get moved to political purgatory. That's their plan.

Now, if you are one of the big five oil companies that are reporting record profits, you get raptured with all of your tax breaks left intact in this budget, which we are debating here today. You keep all of your tax breaks.

But if you are a college kid hoping to get a Pell Grant, no, ladies and gentlemen, you are back in political purgatory. Your educational future is in question.

Now, if you are an insurance company executive and you are now really rapturously happy because of the privatization of Medicare and the incredibly increased profits for the insurance

industry, you are up here in heaven. You get raptured. This is the budget we are debating right now. Good news for all these wealthy people.

But if you have Alzheimer's or cancer and you are hoping to find medical breakthroughs, they are cutting the NIH budget, the national institutes of hope budget, to find a cure for those diseases. Your hopes and dreams go to political purgatory.

And if you have any hopes at all of having Medicare be saved, well, their budget guarantees that Medicare gets privatized, that Medicare is ended as we know it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MARKEY. And that Medicare budget is completely and totally smashed.

So there is your debate here today, ladies and gentlemen. Are you with billionaires, Big Insurance, Big Oil? Are you with Grandma and Grandpa, making sure that Medicare remains intact for the years ahead, honoring the promise that we made to them for giving us this great country that we live in today. That's the vote today.

Vote "yes" or "no" on Grandma, vote "no" on that Republican budget, and protect Grandma's health care into the future.

Mr. REED. I would like to submit section 501 of House Concurrent Resolution 34 for the RECORD as we seem to be commenting about it to a great extent this afternoon. I just want the record to be clear.

#### SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 46 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in and near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2020 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy. Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 7.2 percent per year, and under CBO's alternative fiscal scenario, mandatory spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 percent of GDP by 2080.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in and near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to

provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(4) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I would like to thank my friend from New York (Mr. REED), also a Rules Committee member that I serve with, for the opportunity to support this rule and support the underlying legislation, H.R. 2017, which appropriates funds for our Nation's Homeland Security operations for 2012.

Just a comment: I thought that's what we are here to talk about, and so we are going to go back on track in regards to where we should be. As a member of the Rules Committee, I am proud of this rule. It is the first open rule in 4 years, Mr. Speaker, and that's because of you.

It's a continuation of our promise to the American people that we are committed to bringing openness and free-flowing debate to this Chamber as a service to the American public. And just like the rule keeps our promises to the American people, so does the underlying legislation.

It keeps our promise to reduce spending, to narrow the size and scope of the Federal Government. It also keeps our promise to provide those men and women who work day in and day out to keep our Nation safe with the tools and the resources they need.

I have heard a lot about local first responders in connection with this bill. Mr. Speaker, I spent my entire career in law enforcement. I spent the last 40 years as a cop, and the last 10 of those years I served as a sheriff of a county in Florida.

You don't need to tell me about what our local first responders need. I know it firsthand, I have lived it. And I can tell you this: We need to follow the local example that those folks in Florida and across this Nation and States have shown us. Our local police and firefighters know how to do more with less, one thing the Federal Government has never quite grasped.

Would you like to have more money? Sure we would. But they understand our Nation is in a dire fiscal situation, and what they want more than anything else is for America to be here for their future and their children and grandchildren's future.

□ 1350

When I was sheriff, I was faced with budget shortages, and I made tough cuts. I eliminated programs I'm sure that I would have loved to have kept in place, but they didn't meet the core mission that I was elected to do. That's how local government works, Mr. Speaker, and Washington needs to learn from local governments in regards to how to get their act together as it relates to spending.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2017 is a good bill, and I applaud the Appropriations Committee for their commitment to our homeland security. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation and support the open rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, the ranking member on Homeland Security, Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 2017, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2012.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks. As Americans began to process the carnage inflicted by Osama bin Laden on our soil, then-President Bush challenged us as a nation to "confront every threat from any source that could bring sudden terror and suffering to America." For nearly 10 years, we've done just that. We've made major investments in intelligence, border security, transportation security, and emergency preparedness.

H.R. 2017 suddenly veers away from these incremental efforts and, as a result, sets our Nation on a dangerously wrong path. To cut homeland security preparedness grants by \$2.1 billion at a time when DHS is calling for a period of heightened alert because of our successful action against bin Laden is deplorable and reckless.

How we can continue these efforts with an appropriation bill that funds DHS at 7 percent below what President Obama tells us that DHS needs is beyond me.

The probability of a terrorist attack on a major domestic transit system has not subsided, nor has Mother Nature relented and softened the barrage of punishing blows to our communities, including much of my own congressional district. This bill sacrifices the security of our communities just to save a penny here and a penny there.

Our first responders must not be treated as pawns to the political ideology of the day. It is the decimation of the first responder grant programs, at the hands of the Republican leadership, that, by far, is the most offensive aspect of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. The second most offensive aspect of this bill is the shenanigans surrounding the funding of disaster emergencies. Lastly, ending Medicare in this rule makes absolutely no sense.

For these reasons, I oppose H.R. 2017 and ask my colleagues to join me in voting against the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. REED. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rules Committee and

the Budget Committee, I'm excited to be down here today. You told us, Mr. Speaker, when this Congress began that we were going to witness one of the most open Congresses in this country's history, and you have delivered on that each and every day.

Now, I'm one of the new guys in Congress. I've only been here about 125 days, but what I saw—we're talking about budgets here today. What I saw in the budget process was a leadership team and the chair of the Rules Committee who said, Bring me a budget, any budget. I don't care who you are, whether you're the most senior Member of this body or the most junior Member of this body, bring me a budget, and we will consider it on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. Come all. Come all. Give us your ideas, and we will consider them.

Well, we had that process. I voted for two budgets on that budget voting day. I voted for the Republican Study Committee budget, which I thought was a great budget, and I voted for the Budget Committee's budget.

I sit on the Budget Committee with PAUL RYAN, and the Budget Committee put in a tremendous amount of work, and that was the budget that ended up carrying the day. And so that's the budget we're operating under right here today.

The Homeland Security appropriations bill, the first bill out of the chute. And what did you do, Mr. Speaker? You said, Come one, come all. If you have an idea about how to improve this appropriations bill, bring it to the floor of the House and we'll consider it. Bring it to the floor of the House and we'll consider it.

Now, you might think, if you don't know as much about this House, if you're a newcomer like me, you might think it goes on that way all the time. But it doesn't because it's hard. It's hard.

I can only imagine, Mr. Speaker, what you get from folks back home, because they probably say to you, close down the process. Push your conservative agenda. Do it your way and make people fall in line. And you said no. You said the House works best when the House works its will. You said any Member of the House that can find 218 Members to agree with him can work their will on the floor.

And that's the process that we're opening up. Not a Republican process, not a Democratic process, but an American process where the power of the ideas are what rules the day.

Now, that's taken a huge commitment from the Speaker and a huge commitment from the Rules Committee chairman to make this process happen and a huge commitment from the Appropriations chairman to make this happen. But I'll tell you, for anybody out there who is thinking in partisan terms, it takes a commitment from both sides of the aisle. Open rules break down when we can't make those open rules work together.

I see my friend, Mr. POLIS, from the Rules Committee, who is a strong advocate of the open rules process, and here we are for the first time since July of 2007. And we're going to find out if we can make this work together—a new crowd on your side of the aisle; a new crowd on my side of the aisle. We're going to find out if we can make it work together. Golly, I hope we can.

I hope we can, because it's the right thing to do, because I only have a voice in this body when I can bring my amendments to the floor. I only have a voice in this body when I can represent the 921,000 people back home. Mr. Speaker, you have given that to us over and over again, and I thank you.

Mr. POLIS. The Democrats have no problem with the open rule. What the Democrats have a problem with is the elimination of Medicare, which is deemed and passed in the language of the rule itself and cannot be amended after the passage of the rule.

It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that is on the floor today because voting for this rule is a vote to abolish Medicare.

Here we are, once again, after the public has spoken so clearly on this subject of wanting to have Medicare as a pillar of health and economic security for our seniors, the Republicans saying we're going to double down. Not only did we vote to abolish Medicare, increasing costs for seniors, lowering benefits while giving tax breaks to oil companies and corporations for shipping jobs overseas, not only have we done that once, but we're going to do it again today, on a day that we're going to swear in a new Member of Congress, a reminder that all of us takes an oath of office to protect and defend.

And this bill, the bill that this rule comes up on, Homeland Security, undermines the ability to protect and defend the American people.

So, this is a double whammy. It's a threat, again, to the health and economic security of our seniors and those who depend on Medicare, and it is a threat to the safety of the American people.

I heard my colleague, Mr. MARKEY, talk about purgatory and rapture and the rest in his original and effective presentation, and it reminded me what we always say when we talk about a budget: that it should be a statement of our values. What is important to us should be reflected there.

Our budget proposals—we had one under the leadership of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN that was heard and voted on by the floor a number of weeks ago; a Republican budget that is on the floor today in the form of this rule—are windows to the soul of whom we are as public officials. And this rule today which deems passage of the Republican budget is a window to the soul of the Republican Party and this House of Representatives.

Giving tax subsidies to Big Oil would benefit corporations that shift jobs overseas and would give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country while it says to seniors, No more Medicare for you. You're going to pay more, get less, and weaken the middle class at the same time, weakening the middle class because of abolishing Medicare and weakening the middle class because of what it does to education for our young children and making college more expensive for nearly 10 million young people in our country.

□ 1400

Is that an investment in the future? I don't think so.

But it's really important when we talk about our soul and our values and what our priorities are that we note that a vote for this bill is a really serious assault on the middle class. People are concerned about the dignity and retirement of our seniors. They are concerned about the education of our children. They want to reduce the deficit. We must create jobs. Growth in our economy will help reduce the deficit. This bill does none of the above.

So, again, it's about what we believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I have to give you credit for this, that the Republicans are true to what they believe in. They do not believe in Medicare, and they are voting today to honor their beliefs to abolish Medicare. That has been a consistent message over time. It is reinforced here today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is necessary to again correct the record that what we have done in the proposal that has just been referenced by my colleague from California is not to destroy Medicare; it is to save Medicare. In an open and honest way, it's to deal with the problem that we all know Medicare faces. It clearly states in the document, in the resolution that was passed, that any senior who is in Medicare, on Medicare or within a generation of retiring into Medicare will not be impacted by anything that we do in that budget.

I would also remind my colleague from California that we stand here today under a proposed open rule, where this body, this Chamber, will be able to express its will in an open and traditional process of open amendments.

Let me make clear to the American people what that means. That means that any elected Member of this Congress can come down and speak the voice of his or her constituents and offer amendments that can be debated on the floor of this House in an open and transparent manner—on TV, in their living rooms—so that the American people know what we are doing in this Chamber.

I applaud you, Mr. Speaker, for honoring that commitment that you set forth when you assumed that chair.

At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

(Mr. SOUTHERLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I will tell you, I've been here for 5 months; and a few moments ago I was as angry as I've been in a long time because, this afternoon, we heard the injection of a Judeo-Christian event that I was taught as a little boy is precious to my faith and to the tenets of Judeo-Christians around this world.

I cannot sit and not rise and object and ask everyone in this body: Please let's identify limits to what we will say and where we will go, because what we say here the world listens to; but more importantly, the God that we pray to listens, too.

So it bothers me greatly. I am angered—angered—at what I heard and what I witnessed. In trying to be in control of my emotions, I would just ask everyone: Please let's not inject religious events that many of us are looking forward to in our futures.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. A point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. If this rule is passed, would an amendment be germane that would restore Medicare under the budget?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not respond to hypothetical questions.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. So 5 months. One of my freshman colleagues said 125 days in the Republican majority and no jobs bill.

In fact, all you've tried to do is change Medicare as we know it to make vulnerable seniors pay more and get less. Oh, then you're also making education cuts to go after the dreams and aspirations of our young people. That's the Republican way.

Today, we consider this rule and the Homeland Security's appropriations bill where you actually cut 60 percent of the moneys that the Federal Government sends to our local cities—yes, those cities that are struggling, those cities that protect us. We don't protect the American people from the Capitol. It's the local law enforcement, the local fire department, the local hospitals. If a terrorist attack or a natural disaster happens, the local responders are the ones who first help the American people, and you're cutting the money. They're already under attack at the local level. They have already let firemen and policemen go, and now you're taking away 60 percent of the moneys that we send to protect the American people. What is troubling is that you're limiting the cities where

we send some of this money, like under the Urban Areas Security Initiative.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. You're cutting moneys to places like Las Vegas and Orlando and my hometown of Anaheim, California, where Disneyland is. The American people deserve to be protected, and this Congress should get its priorities straight.

Mr. REED. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. In just moments from now, we will have a new Democratic colleague from my home State of New York. The Democratic Congresswoman-elect hails from the most Republican district in my State, a district that JOHN MCCAIN won in 2008.

Just one week ago, voters in her conservative-leaning district resoundingly rejected the Republican plan to end Medicare. Apparently, the Republican majority here in Washington didn't get the message. Voting to end Medicare once was not enough for them. The rule vote that we are about to take will, once again, deem the Ryan plan to end Medicare as enacted and will put us on a road to ruin where seniors will see out-of-pocket expenses skyrocket by at least \$6,000 every year as Medicare is ended so as to continue the handouts of tens of billions of dollars to oil companies.

In a few moments, after they've finished voting to end Medicare again, I hope that as my Republican colleagues congratulate our New York colleague on her election they will see her as yet another face and as yet another voice, an outspoken voice, to save Medicare.

Mr. REED. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if this rule passes, an amendment will not be in order to restore Medicare under the bill. Again, while this claims to be an open rule—and it is for purposes of Department of Homeland Security amendments—it cannot be amended to undo the budget that is deemed passed in the rule, itself.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, which will end Medicare as we know it, and also to the underlying bill, which reduces Homeland Security grants by 50 percent to our cities, to our ports, to our transit.

Is there any reason to believe, I ask my Republican colleagues, that there is a 50 percent reduction in threat?

If anything, law enforcement tells us that the number of threats is up since the death of Osama bin Laden. Police Commissioner Kelly, in New York City,

tells me that since 9/11 there have been 13 serious terrorist attempts, and six of these were focused on mass transit, which has been cut by 50 percent.

We need to remember what law enforcement has told us: that our antiterrorist efforts have to be right every day, every hour, every second, every time. Yet terrorists just have to be lucky once.

I ask my Republican colleagues: What would be the impact on the loss of lives and on our economy if we were attacked again as they are trying to do? The chatter is up. Law enforcement tells us the threat is up, not down. So why are we cutting it 50 percent?

□ 1410

My Republican colleagues, I say to you that you are not just gambling with dollars; you are gambling with lives. It is not a gamble Democrats are willing to take.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule that we are debating here today so that we can debate a bill on homeland security. Now, that might come as a surprise to many who are watching this debate, or to the Speaker or anyone else in this Chamber today, that we are actually debating a rule that deals with homeland security.

Now, the fantasy discussion going on on the left right now on any topic that comes to mind might be entertaining to some, but for the rest of this country, they would love to see this body actually debate issues that are on topic, and that issue is homeland security. Agencies like Border Patrol, ICE agents, Coast Guard personnel, the Secret Service, funding for all sorts of agencies, \$1 billion for FEMA disaster relief fund, are these not issues important enough to discuss on the floor today?

The bill prohibits the use of funds to move detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the United States and denies them immigration benefits such as visas, admission into the United States, and classification as refugees, all sorts of things that are critical to homeland security, to protecting Americans from terrorism, keeping Americans safe.

And we are doing it under an open rule, and that is the issue on this rule debate. For the first time in 4 years, we are debating an appropriations bill that affects hundreds of millions of Americans related to homeland security, and we are allowing every side to bring amendments down to the floor and to discuss those issues.

This is a critical moment. No matter how many times the folks on the left want to come forward and obfuscate or change the subject, that's fine, we can have those debates. And we will continue to have those debates. But we are

debating today a rule that will allow this body, in an open fashion for the first time in anyone's memory, to debate an open rule on homeland security. If you have an amendment that is germane to the bill, bring it. If it is found worthy, it will pass. This is the process that we used in committee, and it worked. We produced a good piece of legislation that will provide for the security of the homeland.

We have an opportunity today to seriously debate the topic that is before us on homeland security. No matter how many times the left attempts to change the subject from what we are talking about, we know that the homeland security of our country, protecting us from terrorism, is a critical issue and we will debate it, no matter how many times the left tries to stop us.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman mentioned the open rule. The open rule itself is largely noncontroversial with strong support from both sides of the aisle.

What is contained in this rule is the broadest sweeping policy change in recent history, namely, the elimination of Medicare. That is the controversial element of this rule, which is deemed and passed by the rule itself.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, for years, working Americans, paycheck after paycheck, week after week, have paid taxes into the Medicare trust fund. And after they paid those taxes, this country made a promise to them that Medicare's guaranteed benefits would be there for them for the rest of their life. The issue before the House today is whether we honor or dishonor that promise.

The Republican plan to abandon Medicare abandons those guaranteed benefits. The Republican plan to abandon Medicare says that rather than seniors and their doctors deciding what care the seniors should get, private health insurance companies make that decision.

Part of the promise of Medicare was that health care would be reasonably affordable to our seniors and retirees. The Republican plan to abandon Medicare violates that promise. It raises the out-of-pocket cost of health care for our seniors by \$6,000 a year.

We agree that Medicare needs improvement and that Medicare outlays need to be restrained. That's why we support giving the Medicare administration the same authority to negotiate prescription drug prices that the VA has, instead of just paying whatever the drug companies demand.

The issue in this vote is not simply the value of Medicare; the issue in this vote is whether Americans can value the promise that we made to them in the future. Vote against this rule; vote to honor the promise of Medicare.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify for the record again that this proposed resolution that we are debating, this rule on Homeland Security appropriations, that is Homeland Security funding, it is but a simple resolution. It is not law. It will not become law. That is clearly articulated in the parliamentary guide entitled "How Our Laws Are Made" on pages 8 and 9.

So I again feel compelled to clarify the record to assure that this rule will not end Medicare. And even as our budget clearly states, Medicare under our budget will be saved. Not one senior on Medicare will be impacted by any action in that budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, I have to disagree with my friend from New York. I have never seen in my 3 years on the Rules Committee such a broad and sweeping deem-and-pass under a rule. Section 2 of the rule clearly states that the House Concurrent Resolution 34 shall have force and effect. Again "force and effect," the traditional language of something that is deemed and passed under a rule. The mere passage of this rule will deem and pass the end of Medicare as we know it as contained in House Concurrent Resolution 34, the Republican budget.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished manager of this rule, and I certainly thank Members who are on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the baseball season and you can imagine a throng of teeming audience, and they are watching pitch one, pitch two, pitch three; and it is strike one, strike two and strike three.

The winning side, the Republicans, of course, cheer; but the American people lose. They're out. They're struck out. Medicare is gone as we know it. Let's not fool around. Let's not try to have smoke and mirrors.

This rule ends Medicare as we know it. We don't have to play games. The debt relief that was put on the floor ends Medicare as we know it. And this bill on homeland security is tone deaf to the words of the late Osama bin Laden who said that we're looking at your airports, we're looking at your airlines, and we're looking at your rail. This Homeland Security appropriations bill cuts all of the necessary security that is necessary to protect the American people.

First we throw out the seniors on Medicare; then we don't allow for TSO inspectors. We cut FEMA dollars in the face of Joplin and Birmingham and Tuscaloosa. In my own State, there are fires that are burning right now, and we're telling FEMA that we don't have enough money to provide for you. Did you see the story on the news that indicated that firefighters were left watching a man drown—drown—because they had to cut the rescue team of that community? People were crying. Firefighters, whose first job is to

be a first responder, denied because they don't have the funding to be able to help the people that they serve.

I tell you to vote "no" on this rule. Strike out those folks, and let the American people win.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time both sides have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REED. I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that this is a serious topic that we are talking about here today, the Homeland Security appropriations bill. When you pass a responsible budget, as we did here in the House, you've got to make tough choices. I learned here as a freshman that we do these 10-year budget plans, but only year one matters because then the next Congress comes back and does year two and year three and year four. So the only serious decisions that we are making in this budget is what happens in year one, and that's the Homeland Security appropriations bill that is before us here today. How are we going to fund Homeland Security for year one?

And we are down here talking about all of these ancillary issues; and I tell you, this one's important. This one's important. This one's happening. This isn't smoke and mirrors 10 years down the road. This is happening today. The Appropriations Committee has worked long and hard to craft the best delicate balance that they could.

Mr. Speaker, 42 cents out of every dollar we're borrowing. Folks talk about we don't have any money. That's not a state of mind; that's a fact.

□ 1420

It's a fact. And we cannot afford to shortchange the work that we're doing on the Homeland Security appropriations bill on these—I can't think of a kind word to say.

I'm not going to say anything at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

From the retirees that I serve in south Florida to the middle class families of western New York, the American people have overwhelmingly rejected the reckless Republican budget.

The Republican budget ends Medicare and replaces it with a coupon, a coupon that fails to even approach the cost of private health insurance. It guts Medicaid, depended on by millions of impoverished children, nursing home patients, seniors who need home health services, and disabled Americans. Its hatchet job on our budget will destroy

2.1 million jobs when we cannot afford higher unemployment.

This plan is opposed by the Senate, the President, and, most importantly, the American people. Yet today Republicans will vote to deem and pass the Ryan budget.

The distinguished Rules Committee chairman, who decried deem and pass during the health care reform debate and claimed “process is substance,” has apparently had a stunning change of heart. We were told that using deem and pass to extend health care coverage to the uninsured is an abomination. Apparently, we learned today it should be reserved for slashing benefits to seniors.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule. The American people want a bipartisan budget that responsibly reduces the deficit, creates new jobs, and protects Medicare and Medicaid for disabled and elderly Americans. Not this Republican budget.

Mr. REED. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. The distinguished chair of the Budget Committee spoke here a few minutes ago. He spoke about a moral obligation.

An interesting definition of “moral obligation”: An obligation to maintain the benefits that the insurance industry has; an obligation to maintain the subsidy that the American taxpayers give to the richest industry in this world, the oil industry, billions of dollars a year; an obligation to maintain the tax benefits to the wealthiest millionaires and billionaires in the world. Apparently, that’s his definition of a moral obligation.

We have a different definition on our side of the aisle. We have a definition on our side of the aisle that says it is the obligation of this society to provide medical care to our seniors. Our Republican colleagues see their moral obligation as terminating, ending, Medicare for all Americans who are not yet 55 years of age.

Say it any way you want, but that’s precisely what your budget does. It terminates Medicare. Is that your moral obligation?

It’s not ours on our side. Our side is to maintain the promise that when a senior in the United States becomes 65 years of age, they will have Medicare.

Our good chairman comes and he says we’re not cutting benefits for seniors. That’s not true. In fact, you’re cutting \$700 billion out of the Medicaid—Medicaid—program, a program where two-thirds of the money goes to seniors who are in nursing homes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHOCK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

You say it’s a moral obligation to cut \$500 billion out of the health care bill? No way. That was money that came out of a subsidy to the insurance companies. And you say it’s a moral obligation to leave the insurance companies alone so they can continue their rapaciousness against the people of America.

Mr. REED. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to moving forward the Homeland Security bill under an open rule—which would have strong bipartisan support, and I praise my colleagues on the Rules Committee and hope that this is the first of many open rules. In addition to moving forward the Homeland Security bill under the rule, this rule includes language “deeming” the Ryan budget passed. That’s right. We’re voting once again on the same plan that the American people resoundingly rejected in last week’s special election in New York.

If this rule passes, the Ryan budget, which ends Medicare, will become the final, enforceable budget on the House side until a conference report is adopted, which is unlikely to happen in this Congress, especially if the House Republicans continue to insist on the end of Medicare as a condition of passing a final budget. A “yes” vote on this rule is a “yes” vote on the Ryan plan and a “yes” vote to eliminate Medicare.

Now, this is the sixth time in 36 years that the House and Senate will fail to adopt a budget, and the House has used deeming resolutions in the past. However, never has a deeming resolution been used for such a tremendous policy change, namely, the elimination of Medicare.

As then-Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER said, “This legislative trick has been around for a long time, but it’s never been used for a bill so controversial and so massive in scope.”

Now that, Mr. Speaker, was in reference to the Democratic efforts last session to pass the Affordable Care Act. The deem and pass was not used at the end of the day to pass that bill; yet here we are in the 112th Congress with the Republicans seeking to use it to end Medicare. And, yes, no bones about it, we are talking about ending Medicare.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, and our bipartisan study group has confirmed, a typical beneficiary would spend more for health care under the proposal than under the Congressional Budget Office’s long-term scenarios. Second, the government’s contribution would grow more slowly than health care costs, leaving more for beneficiaries to pay.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the elimination of Medicare

under this rule. Not even under a bill with debate on both sides. Not even amendable. A rule is not amendable. Although this rule provides for debate of the Homeland Security bill, which will be fair and allow amendments to be put forth by both parties under it, the rule itself, Mr. Speaker, is not amendable. It’s immutable, unchangeable, and, if passed by this body of the House of Representatives, will deem a budget passed that eliminates Medicare for the American people.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I also will be opposing the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have had a spirited debate on the floor of this Chamber over this rule. I applaud that debate because that’s what the American people sent us here to do, which is to have the debate in an open process on TV in front of the American people. And that’s what this rule does.

□ 1430

This rule is a true open rule where any Member of this Chamber—Democrat or Republican—can come down and submit an amendment, debate it in front of the American people, and have it voted on by each and every Member of this House so that this House will speak its will. I applaud our Speaker for accomplishing that clear goal he set out.

But as we have this debate, Mr. Speaker, I remind all my colleagues that America also sent us a message last November that we need to be honest with the American people. It means that we do not play games in this Chamber. And nothing could be further from the truth than the constant arguments that we had to stand up and clarify that this rule kills Medicare as we know it.

This rule has no legal effect. This rule will not be presented to the President for signature and become law of the land. And mind you, the reference to the House Republican budget, the “Paul Ryan” budget, the provision that has been talked about here to great extent clearly states that it is the policy of this Chamber, the policy as set forth in that budget, that all those on Medicare will not be impacted by that budget. All those seniors who are within 10 years of retiring and becoming eligible for Medicare will not be impacted by that budget.

We are acting in a responsible manner on this side of the aisle. And we are dealing with dire times. I was a little disappointed that we didn’t have a more spirited debate on the actual substance of the rule that guides the bill upon which it applies, and that is the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

We live in dire fiscal times in the United States of America. And we’re going to be honest with the American people: We have to make some tough choices. But this should send a message

to every man, woman, and child in America that the days of reckless spending have caught up to us because we do have to have the debate of where we're going to cut. And we are talking about cuts in the areas of homeland security. We better wake up as a body and as a Chamber and recognize that if we don't get our fiscal house in order not only will we jeopardize our national security, we will go bankrupt. That ends America as we know it. And also, it will destroy the American market that we are trying to ignite in our private sector because if we do not send a message that we've got our fiscal house in order, then people are not going to invest in America, and that will not put people back to work and put people back onto a payroll.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM LAW REVISION COUNSEL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Peter G. LeFevre, Law Revision Counsel:

OFFICE OF THE LAW REVISION COUNSEL,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 23, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: After 30 years of service in the Office of the Law Revision Counsel and over 34 years with the Federal Government, I have decided it is time to retire. With your approval, my last day as Law Revision Counsel will be June 1, 2011.

I started with the Office just seven years after it was established as part of the Bolling Committee reforms in 1974. The Office was given the functions of classifying new laws to the United States Code, preparing and publishing the Code, and drafting legislation to enact titles of the Code into positive law. Over the years, I have had the privilege of working on each of these functions, and my career has given me a unique perspective on the content and codification of Federal law.

I have had at least a technical familiarity with practically every law enacted during the past 25 years and have worked my way through thousands of laws, including countless appropriations, defense authorizations, tax and health reforms, and omnibus reconciliations. We, in the Office of the Law Revision Counsel, regard the text of these laws with a certain reverence. As we incorporate new laws into the Code, every effort is made

to ensure that each word, each punctuation mark, and each directive they contain is given the effect intended by Congress. With the systems and excellent staff we have in place in the Office, I feel confident that the Code is being maintained with the high degree of accuracy and reliability that is required for the official Code.

While accuracy has always been our highest priority, we have also been working on improving the timeliness and usability of the Code. Since 2005, the time it takes to do an annual update of the Code has been reduced by more than 18 months, and last year we introduced the USCprelim on the U.S. Code website to allow even quicker, albeit preliminary, updates of selected Code titles. As to usability, the Code is about to get a lot better. In a matter of days, we will release a new U.S. Code website featuring a new sophisticated search engine, improved interface, and materials to help the public understand and use the Code. The release will soon be followed by further improvements, including hyperlinks to referenced Code and statute provisions and integration of the USCprelim and prior versions of the Code into the new website. Conversion of the Code data into XML is another ongoing project which should bear fruit in the near future.

The overall organization of the Code remains a concern for me, but significant progress was made during the last several years. The codification of title 46, Shipping, was completed with the enactment of Public Law 109-304, and in just the past six months, Law Revision Counsel bills to enact title 41, Public Contracts, and title 51, National and Commercial Space Programs, became law. Each new positive law title is a major accomplishment, but the time and effort it took to get these three titles enacted indicates the huge task that remains before the goal of an entirely enacted Code is realized.

It has been a pleasure to work for the House of Representatives throughout my career. I have especially enjoyed my association with the other staff members in my office and have a deep appreciation of their expertise and dedication and the fine work they do every day. I am also grateful for the support and cooperation of your office, the Committees on the Judiciary and Appropriations, the Government Printing Office, and the other officers of the House.

Respectfully Yours,

PETER G. LEFEVRE,  
Law Revision Counsel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, statements by the Speaker and the Minority Leader are inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and thank Peter G. LeFevre, Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives, who will retire on June 1, 2011, after 30 years of distinguished service to the House and 34 years with the Federal government.

Throughout his years with the Office of the Law Revision Counsel, Peter has worked tirelessly to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the United States Code. Peter has technical familiarity with practically every law enacted by Congress over the past quarter century. His expertise, hard work, integrity, and commitment to quality have benefitted the House and earned him the deep regard of his colleagues.

As Law Revision Counsel, Peter has significantly improved the procedures for preparing and publishing the Code. He has been instrumental in upgrading the technology used to produce and access the Code. During his tenure, the Office website has been revitalized

and the Code has become much more current in its annual supplement updates. The recent introduction of USCprelim, an advance posting of selected Code titles, has further improved public access to codified Federal legislation. Peter has also been responsible for overseeing the enactment of several non-positive law titles into positive law, a significant accomplishment enhancing the quality and organization of the Code.

On behalf of the House, I would like to commend Peter for his years of dedication and his many contributions to the Federal government, and in particular to the House of Representatives. Peter's diligent service day after day will be an example to those who serve after him. Peter has been a valuable asset to this institution and to his country. We will miss him.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our Law Revision Counsel, Peter G. LeFevre, for his contributions to our Nation's laws, for his commitment to the House of Representatives, and for his service to the American people.

Peter's actions and achievements rarely receive the recognition he and his colleagues deserve; too few know the significance of his accomplishments behind the scenes. But legislators, litigators, lawyers, and anyone interested in the laws of our land rely on his work each and every day.

Since joining the office of the Law Revision Counsel 30 years ago, Peter has been a key member of the dedicated team of non-partisan professionals and experts who revise, prepare, and publish the U.S. Code. He has served under seven successive Speakers of the House of both parties, maintaining the Code, updating it, and drafting legislation to improve the codification of federal law.

Over the past seven years, Peter has led the office, appointed as the Law Revision Counsel by Speaker Dennis Hastert. During his tenure, he oversaw all aspects of the preparation and publication of the Code, ensuring its accuracy and reliability. He has worked on thousands of public laws, including appropriations, defense authorizations, tax and health reforms, and omnibus reconciliations, and guided the Office of the Law Revision Counsel through the many challenges brought on by changes in personnel and technological innovations.

Those of us who are fortunate enough to have known and worked with Peter are grateful for his leadership.

Peter G. LeFevre has left his mark on our laws, on the Congress, on our country's history. For today's lawmakers, his contributions have been invaluable; for generations yet to come, his work will provide an unbroken link to the debates and legislation of the last 30 years.

Peter's many years of dedication to the federal government and to the House of Representatives should be a source of pride to him and his family. We thank and commend Peter for his service, and wish him well in his retirement.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question

on House Resolution 287, by the yeas and nays; adoption of House Resolution 287, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 802, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

# PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2017, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 186, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

## YEAS—235

Adams	Crenshaw	Harris
Aderholt	Culberson	Hartzler
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Denham	Hayworth
Amash	Dent	Heck
Austria	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bachus	Dold	Herrera Beutler
Barletta	Dreier	Huelskamp
Bartlett	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Barton (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bass (NH)	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Benishkek	Ellmers	Hurt
Berg	Emerson	Issa
Biggert	Farenthold	Jenkins
Bilbray	Fincher	Johnson (IL)
Billirakis	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Black	Fleischmann	Jones
Blackburn	Fleming	Jordan
Bonner	Flores	Kelly
Bono Mack	Forbes	King (IA)
Boustany	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Fox	Kingston
Brooks	Franks (AZ)	Kinzie (IL)
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Buchanan	Galleghy	Labrador
Bucshon	Gardner	Lamborn
Buerkle	Garrett	Lance
Burgess	Gerlach	Landry
Burton (IN)	Gibbs	Lankford
Calvert	Gibson	Latham
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	LaTourette
Campbell	Goodlatte	Latta
Canseco	Gosar	Lewis (CA)
Cantor	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Capito	Granger	Long
Carter	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Cassidy	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Chabot	Griffin (AR)	Lungren, Daniel
Chaffetz	Griffith (VA)	E.
Coble	Grimm	Mack
Coffman (CO)	Guinta	Marchant
Cole	Guthrie	Marino
Conaway	Hall	McCarthy (CA)
Cravaack	Hanna	McCaul
Crawford	Harper	McClintock

McCotter	Reed	Simpson
McHenry	Rehberg	Smith (NE)
McKeon	Reichert	Smith (NJ)
McKinley	Renacci	Smith (TX)
McMorris	Ribble	Southerland
Rodgers	Rigell	Stearns
Meehan	Rivera	Stivers
Mica	Roby	Stutzman
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Mulvaney	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Murphy (PA)	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Neugebauer	Rokita	Tipton
Noem	Rooney	Turner
Nugent	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Nunes	Roskam	Walberg
Nunnelee	Ross (FL)	Walden
Olson	Royce	Walsh (IL)
Palazzo	Runyan	Webster
Paul	Ryan (WI)	West
Paulsen	Scalise	Westmoreland
Pearce	Schilling	Whitfield
Pence	Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Schock	Wittman
Pitts	Schweikert	Wolf
Platts	Scott (SC)	Womack
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Posey	Sessions	Young (AK)
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Young (FL)
Quayle	Shuster	Young (IN)

## NAYS—186

Ackerman	Engel	McNerney
Altmire	Eshoo	Meeks
Andrews	Farr	Michaud
Baca	Fattah	Miller (NC)
Baldwin	Filner	Miller, George
Barrow	Frank (MA)	Moore
Bass (CA)	Fudge	Moran
Becerra	Garamendi	Murphy (CT)
Berkley	Green, Al	Nadler
Berman	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Neal
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Oliver
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Owens
Boren	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Boswell	Heinrich	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Braley (IA)	Himes	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hinchee	Pelosi
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Capps	Hiron	Peters
Capuano	Holden	Peterson
Cardoza	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Carnahan	Honda	Polis
Carney	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Inslee	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Israel	Rahall
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Chu	Jackson Lee	Reyes
Cicilline	(TX)	Richardson
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Ross (AR)
Clay	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Cleaver	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Kind	Rush
Connolly (VA)	Kissell	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Cooper	Langevin	T.
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Costello	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Critz	Levin	Schiff
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Cuellar	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Loeb sack	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Sewell
DeFazio	Lujan	Sherman
DeGette	Lynch	Shuler
DeLauro	Maloney	Sires
Deutch	Markey	Slaughter
Dicks	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Matsui	Speier
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Donnelly (IN)	McCollum	Sutton
Doyle	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	McIntyre	Tonko

Towns	Waters	Wilson (FL)
Tsongas	Watt	Woolsey
Van Hollen	Waxman	Wu
Velázquez	Weiner	Yarmuth
Visclosky	Welch	

## NOT VOTING—10

Giffords	Manzullo	Walz (MN)
Gohmert	Myrick	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Schwartz	Schultz
Lucas	Tierney	

□ 1510

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. SEWELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 27, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,

*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Robert Brehm and Ms. Kimberly Galvin on behalf of Mr. Todd Valentine, Co-Executive Directors, New York State Board of Elections, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held May 24, 2011, the Honorable Kathy Courtney Hochul was elected Representative to Congress for the Twenty-Sixth Congressional District, State of New York.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk.*

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,  
*Albany, NY, May 27, 2011.*

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR Ms. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, May 24, 2011, for Representative in Congress from the Twenty-Sixth Congressional District of New York, show that Kathy Courtney Hochul received 50,890, Jane Corwin received 45,501, Jack Davis received 9,658 and Ian L. Murphy received 1,128 of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Kathy Courtney Hochul was elected as Representative in Congress from the Twenty-Sixth Congressional District of New York.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as official results are certified to this office by all county boards in the Twenty-Sixth Congressional District in New York involved, an official Certification of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BREHM,  
KIMBERLY GALVIN.

## 28th CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—UNOFFICIAL RESULTS

[Recap]

PARTY	CANDIDATE	Part of Erie	Genesee	Livingston	Part of Monroe	Part of Niag- ara	Part of Orle- ans	Wyoming	Total
DEM	Kathy Courtney Hochul	20,953	3,052	3,016	8,018	7,495	1,269	1,993	45,796
WOR	Kathy Courtney Hochul	2,083	325	396	891	1,056	124	219	5,094
TOTAL		23,036	3,377	3,412	8,909	8,551	1,393	2,212	50,890

PARTY	CANDIDATE	Part of Erie	Genesee	Livingston	Part of Monroe	Part of Niag- ara	Part of Orle- ans	Wyoming	Total
REP	Jane L. Corwin	13,226	2,903	2,956	6,293	5,340	1,269	2,405	34,392
CON	Jane L. Corwin	2,815	786	707	2,288	1,363	280	592	8,831
IND	Jane L. Corwin	781	178	205	479	412	77	146	2,278
TOTAL		16,822	3,867	3,868	9,060	7,115	1,626	3,143	45,501

PARTY	CANDIDATE	Part of Erie	Genesee	Livingston	Part of Monroe	Part of Niag- ara	Part of Orle- ans	Wyoming	Total
GRE	Ian L. Murphy	167	106	206	376	140	49	84	1,128
TEA	Jack Davis	2,801	1,277	673	1,681	2,167	384	675	9,658

## 26th CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—Unofficial Results

PARTY	CANDIDATE	100% Part of Erie	100% Genesee	100% Livingston	100% Part of Monroe	100% Part of Niag- ara	100% Part of Orle- ans	100% Wyoming	Total
DEM	Kathy Courtney Hochul	20,953	3,052	3,016	8,018	7,495	1,269	1,993	45,796
REP	Jane L. Corwin	13,226	2,903	2,956	6,293	5,340	1,269	2,405	34,392
CON	Jane L. Corwin	2,815	786	707	2,288	1,363	280	592	8,831
WOR	Kathy Courtney Hochul	2,083	325	396	891	1,056	124	219	5,094
IND	Jane L. Corwin	781	178	205	479	412	77	146	2,278
GRE	Ian L. Murphy	167	106	206	376	140	49	84	1,128
TEA	Jack Davis	2,801	1,277	673	1,681	2,167	384	675	9,658
	BLANK & VOID	53	22	4	22	0	5	0	106
	SCATTERING	65	53	26	76	33	13	15	281
TOTALS		42,944	8,702	8,189	20,124	18,006	3,470	6,129	107,564

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN C. HOCHUL, OF NEW YORK, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York, the Honorable KATHLEEN COURTNEY HOCHUL, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

As pointed out, her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Hochul and the members of the New York delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. HOCHUL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 112th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN C. HOCHUL TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from New York, PETER KING, join with me at this time.

It is a great honor for us at this time to present to you a young lady who did it the hard way. She's earned it. She's here with her husband, Bill, her mother, Pat, her dad, Jack. Bill and Katie, the children, are here. And symbolic of what a great country that we have during this time, a person with her credentials can go to the voters, and show that in this great country of ours, the people govern.

In order to give her the bipartisan support that she truly deserves, I would like to yield at this time to my friend, PETER KING.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just join all of you in welcoming Ms. HOCHUL to the House of Representatives.

Congresswoman, we look forward to working with you on behalf of our Nation and our State, and on behalf of all the Republicans in our delegation, we wish you the very best of luck.

Mr. RANGEL. I present to you Congresswoman KATHLEEN COURTNEY HOCHUL.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized.

Ms. HOCHUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. KING.

It is truly an honor and a privilege to be here on the floor of the U.S. House

of Representatives where I will serve the people of the 26th District of the State of New York. I promise to work for them tirelessly every single day, and I will continue to fight for them with every breath I have.

And I look forward to working with each of you in the spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation as we work toward a brighter future and a stronger America.

This is a proud day for my family and for me as we begin this new chapter in our lives, a chapter I hope to fill with accomplishments that will serve the people of my district as well as all of your districts.

But before I begin this journey, I must thank the people who helped me get where I am today.

To the people of the 26th Congressional District, I am humbled by your support and the faith that you have placed in me. To my family—my husband of 27 years, Bill, you are my rock and my inspiration, honey; to my son, Billy; my daughter, Katie; my parents, Jack and Pat Courtney; my brothers and my sister, Sheila, who worked tirelessly throughout this entire campaign.

A special thanks to the New York congressional delegation, both our Senators and the dozens of Congressmen who supported us throughout this election.

Thanks go to my incredible campaign team and thousands and thousands of supporters and volunteers who worked tirelessly throughout this election, and to one of my great mentors, John LaFalce, whom I was honored to serve many years ago.

Today I enter this Chamber confident that we can tackle the challenges that are presented to us. We can and must find commonsense solutions to the problems facing each of our districts and our country. As we have learned, our constituents expect and deserve no less.

Thank you very much.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Hochul), the whole number of the House is 433.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2017, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which the Chair will put de novo.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 187, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—231

Adams	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Ellmers
Akin	Calvert	Emerson
Alexander	Camp	Farenthold
Amash	Campbell	Fincher
Austria	Canseco	Fitzpatrick
Bachmann	Capito	Flake
Bachus	Carter	Fleischmann
Barletta	Cassidy	Fleming
Bartlett	Chabot	Flores
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Forbes
Bass (NH)	Coble	Fortenberry
Benishkek	Coffman (CO)	Fox
Berg	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Biggert	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bilbray	Cravaack	Galleghy
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gardner
Black	Crenshaw	Garrett
Blackburn	Culberson	Gerlach
Bonner	Davis (KY)	Gibbs
Bono Mack	Denham	Gibson
Boustany	Dent	Gingrey (GA)
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Goodlatte
Brooks	Diaz-Balart	Gosar
Broun (GA)	Dold	Gowdy
Buchanan	Dreier	Granger
Bucshon	Duffy	Graves (GA)
Buerkle	Duncan (SC)	Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)	Marino	Ros-Lehtinen
Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)	Roskam
Grimm	McCauley	Ross (FL)
Guinta	McClintock	Royce
Guthrie	McCotter	Runyan
Hall	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Hanna	McKeon	Scalise
Harper	McKinley	Schilling
Harris	McMorris	Schmidt
Hartzler	Rodgers	Schock
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Schweikert
Hayworth	Mica	Scott (SC)
Heck	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Herger	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Shimkus
Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Shuster
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Simpson
Hultgren	Noem	Smith (NE)
Hunter	Nugent	Smith (NJ)
Hurt	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Issa	Nunnelee	Southerland
Jenkins	Olson	Stearns
Johnson (IL)	Palazzo	Stivers
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Stutzman
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Sullivan
Jordan	Pence	Terry
Kelly	Petri	Thompson (PA)
King (IA)	Pitts	Thornberry
King (NY)	Platts	Tiberi
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Turner
Kline	Posey	Upton
Labrador	Price (GA)	Walberg
Lamborn	Quayle	Walden
Lance	Reed	Walsh (IL)
Landry	Rehberg	Webster
Lankford	Reichert	West
Latham	Renacci	Westmoreland
LaTourette	Ribble	Whitfield
Latta	Rigell	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (CA)	Rivera	Wittman
LoBiondo	Roby	Wolf
Long	Roe (TN)	Womack
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Woodall
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Yoder
Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)
E.	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Mack	Rokita	Young (IN)
Marchant	Rooney	

#### NOES—187

Ackerman	DeLauro	Kucinich
Altmire	Deutch	Langevin
Andrews	Dicks	Larsen (WA)
Baca	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Baldwin	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Levin
Bass (CA)	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Edwards	Lipinski
Berkley	Ellison	Loeb
Berman	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lujan
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lynch
Boren	Filner	Maloney
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Markey
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Matheson
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Matsui
Butterfield	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)
Capps	Green, Gene	McCollum
Capuano	Grijalva	McDermott
Cardoza	Gutierrez	McGovern
Carnahan	Hanabusa	McIntyre
Carney	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Heinrich	Meeks
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Michaud
Chandler	Himes	Miller (NC)
Chu	Hinchoy	Miller, George
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Moore
Clarke (MI)	Hirono	Moran
Clarke (NY)	Hochul	Murphy (CT)
Clay	Holden	Nadler
Cleaver	Holt	Napolitano
Clyburn	Honda	Neal
Cohen	Hoyer	Oliver
Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Owens
Conyers	Israel	Pallone
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Pascarella
Costa	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Costello	(TX)	Paul
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Critz	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Crowley	Jones	Perlmutter
Culler	Kaptur	Peters
Cummings	Keating	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Davis (IL)	Kind	Polis
DeGette	Kissell	Price (NC)

Quigley	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Rahall	Schiff	Tonko
Rangel	Schrader	Towns
Reyes	Scott (VA)	Tsongas
Richardson	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Richmond	Serrano	Velázquez
Ross (AR)	Sewell	Vislousky
Rothman (NJ)	Sherman	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Shuler	Watt
Ruppersberger	Sires	Waxman
Rush	Slaughter	Weiner
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Welch
Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Wilson (FL)
T.	Stark	Woolsey
Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Wu
Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth

#### NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Schwartz
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Tierney
Cantor	Lucas	Walz (MN)
DeFazio	Manzullo	Wasserman
Giffords	Myrick	Schultz

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) (during the vote). There is 1 minute left in the vote.

□ 1526

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 382, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

#### ESTABLISHING VETSTAR AWARD PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 802) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 408, nays 11, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

YEAS—408

Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Adams	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Cardoza
Akin	Black	Carnahan
Alexander	Blackburn	Carney
Altmire	Blumenauer	Carson (IN)
Andrews	Bonner	Carter
Austria	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Baca	Boren	Castor (FL)
Bachmann	Boswell	Chabot
Bachus	Boustany	Chaffetz
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Chu
Barrow	Braley (IA)	Cicilline
Bartlett	Brown (FL)	Clarke (MI)
Barton (TX)	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Bass (CA)	Bucshon	Clay
Bass (NH)	Buerkle	Cleaver
Becerra	Burgess	Clyburn
Benishkek	Burton (IN)	Coble
Berg	Butterfield	Coffman (CO)
Berkley	Calvert	Cohen
Berman	Camp	Cole
Biggert	Canseco	Conaway
Bilbray	Cantor	Connolly (VA)
Bilirakis	Capito	Conyers

Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Filner  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer

Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes

Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schroder  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg

Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Weiner  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NAYS—11

Amash  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Campbell

Duncan (TN)  
Flake  
Graves (GA)  
Kingston

Mulvaney  
Paul  
Rokita

## NOT VOTING—13

Fattah  
Giffords  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Lucas

Manzullo  
Myrick  
Rogers (MI)  
Ryan (WI)  
Schwartz

Tierney  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1533

Ms. BASS of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2017, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2017.

□ 1535

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my honor to present the fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

This bill before us today, perhaps more than any other bill, exemplifies the difficult choices that need to be made in order to address our Nation's fiscal crisis.

This bill demonstrates how we can fully fund vital security programs while also reducing spending overall. Furthermore, this bill does not represent a false choice between fiscal responsibility and security. Both are national security priorities, and both are vigorously addressed in this bill.

I am under no illusion that everyone here in this Chamber will agree with the spending reductions included in this legislation; but now, more than ever, our government needs fiscal discipline, and this bill takes the necessary steps toward that goal.

The bottom line: more money and more government do not equal more security. So in this time of skyrocketing debt and persistent threats, we must get our homeland security priorities right.

The bill before us today provides \$40.6 billion in discretionary funding, or almost \$3 billion, which is 7 percent below the request, and \$1.1 billion, or almost 3 percent below the fiscal year 2011 level. In addition, the bill also includes \$1 billion in offset, emergency supplemental funding for FEMA's disaster relief fund immediately upon enactment. There are no earmarks that are set out in this bill or the accompanying report.

The bill places priority on funding our Nation's greatest security needs—fully funding all frontline personnel such as Border Patrol, CBP officers, ICE officers, Coast Guard military personnel, and Secret Service agents, and fully funding all intelligence, watchlisting, and threat targeting functions.

In addition, the bill provides funding where the administration and the Department of Homeland Security have failed. This bill makes up for the nearly \$650 million shortfall handed to us by the Department through phony, unauthorized fee collections. It is irresponsible for the administration to submit a budget based on the illusion that Congress is going to raise taxes or fees in this current economy.

This bill also addresses the wholly inadequate request for disaster relief funding and provides the resources to help our communities recover from natural disasters, like the unprecedented flooding across the Mississippi

River Valley; the tornadoes that devastated my home State of Alabama a few weeks ago; and the horrific tornado that destroyed much of Joplin, Missouri, just a little over a week ago.

However, programs that have been underperforming and failing to execute their budgets or which have repeatedly ignored congressional directives to measure their results are significantly reduced.

In short, this bill places a priority on the taxpayers' limited dollars towards the security programs that will have an immediate impact upon our national security and responsibly reduces spending wherever possible.

The bill is constructed around three core priorities: number one, fiscal discipline; number two, targeted investments in security operations and disaster relief; and, number three, meaningful, hard-hitting oversight.

First on fiscal discipline. The bill goes further than simply cutting spending. This bill insists upon real reform—reform in how the Department justifies its budget; reform on how FEMA manages its first responder grants; and reform on how FEMA, the Department, and the administration budget for the costs of disaster relief.

□ 1540

Number two, on security, the bill includes nearly \$150 million worth of targeted investments above the budget request for security operations—the frontline programs that are among the most critical at keeping our Nation secure and these activities that directly countered recent terrorist attacks and address known threats.

On disaster relief, I have seen firsthand what natural disasters can do over the past few weeks, and I can tell you that my constituents in Alabama are expecting FEMA to get it right. So this bill picks up from where we left off in FY 2011 and provides an increase of \$850 million above the request and within the budget for FEMA's disaster relief fund to address the known and expected cost of disasters in FY 2012. And as we added unanimously in our full committee markup of the bill last week, \$1 billion in offset, emergency supplemental funding is provided to FEMA to ensure that disaster relief efforts stay on track this year and well into 2012.

And, three, finally, is oversight. Our subcommittee has a long tradition of insisting upon results for each and every taxpayer dollar that is appropriated. This is a testament to the previous leadership on this subcommittee that was exhibited by our founding chairman of this subcommittee, Chairman ROGERS, and also my predecessor and now the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. PRICE.

This bill continues the dedication to frontline security programs and robust oversight by including numerous spend plan requirements, reporting requirements, and operational requirements, such as border patrol staffing levels

and an increase to ICE's detention capacity.

Now, I know there has been some criticism on the funding level this bill is recommending for FEMA's first responder grants. Let me emphasize that there is more than \$13 billion in the pipeline that has not been spent, but FEMA has yet to establish a credible method for measuring the impact of these grants.

So this bill takes bold steps to get FEMA's fiscal house in order—requiring accountability for every dollar spent, requiring a plan for drawing down the enormous unexpended balances, consolidating duplicative grant programs, putting priority on high-risk needs, and rewarding programs like the Emergency Management Performance Grants that actually spend their funds wisely and are willing to measure their results.

I know how important first responders are to this Nation. We see it every day. But we simply cannot keep on throwing money into a clogged pipeline when our debt is soaring out of control. I believe it's our duty to reform these grant programs.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is about putting a priority on limited dollars and robustly supporting the most essential functions. The Department of Homeland Security, with all its critical missions, is not immune from fiscal discipline. That means the Department has to find the most cost-effective way to meet its mission requirements. The American people are demanding no less.

In closing, let me thank Ranking Member PRICE. Although we have certainly had a turbulent year, he has been a statesman and a true partner as we worked on this vital bill. I sincerely thank him for his input and his contributions that he has made on this bill.

In addition, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full committee, Chairman HAL ROGERS and Ranking Member NORM DICKS. As much as we have had to make difficult choices and tradeoffs at subcommittee level, I know that both of these gentlemen have had to make much more difficult decisions dealing with all 12 subcommittee budgets.

Finally, I would like to take a moment to thank the committee staff for their hard work on this bill, namely: Stephanie Gupta and Paul Cox on the minority staff; and Jeff Ashford, Kris Mallard, Kathy Kraninger, Miles Taylor, Rebecca Ore, Brian Rell, Mark Dawson, Anne Marie Malecha, and Ben Nicholson, who is the clerk of this committee, on the majority side.

I believe this bill reflects our best efforts to address our Nation's most urgent needs: security and fiscal discipline. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may utilize.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we're considering the fiscal year 2012 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill in a timely fashion and under an open rule. Chairman ADERHOLT has been a true professional in the drafting of this bill, and I appreciate his willingness to include input from our side all along the way. And I certainly want to share in his commendation of all of our staff on both sides of the aisle.

For the second year in a row, overall funding for the Department of Homeland Security will drop. The bill decreases funding for Homeland Security by 6.8 percent below the President's request and essentially returns funding to the 2009 level, which is concerning to many people, including myself.

This allocation has required Chairman ADERHOLT to make some tough decisions. He has been able to retain adequate funding for the frontline employees of the Department of Homeland Security to continue conducting critical operations along our borders, to protect our Nation's airports and seaports, and to respond to the wave of natural disasters that our country has experienced this spring.

The same, however, is not true, unfortunately, of Homeland Security grant programs, which are cut radically. Providing a total of \$1 billion for all State and local grants, or 65 percent below the President's request, and providing \$350 million for firefighter assistance grants—that's almost 50 percent below an already reduced request—breaks faith with the States and localities that depend on us as partners to secure our communities. These cuts will be especially harmful as many of our States and municipalities are being forced to slash their own budgets.

For example, according to the International Association of Fire Fighters, 1,600 fewer local firefighters will be on the job if the cuts in this bill are enacted. I can't conceive of any defensible argument for cuts of this magnitude, cuts that come on top of cuts to grants already made in the fiscal 2011 appropriations. They will do great damage to local preparedness, to emergency response in our communities, and to the recovering economy.

These grant programs equip our State and local partners to be ready for a disaster so they can mitigate its impact and respond effectively. While this bill rightly seeks to help States and localities rebuild after a disaster strikes, it decimates the work required to prepare for a disaster before it happens. That exposes our communities to greater risk, and it potentially raises the cost of attacks and disasters when they do occur. And we shouldn't ignore the impact of first responder layoffs on our economic recovery.

This bill recommends other drastic reductions, for example, by cutting research funding in half. At this level, the Science and Technology Directorate informed us that it would concentrate its remaining resources on

aviation security and explosive detection devices and on two cutting-edge, near-term research projects. But other critical research underway, including research on cyber security, disaster resiliency, and detection of chemical and biological threats, this research simply wouldn't be funded in 2012, if ever.

The bill also greatly reduces funds for information technology needs and construction activities. It includes no funding for the new DHS headquarters that are already under construction and the related lease consolidation efforts. We've been told repeatedly by the administration that deferring these investments will ultimately affect frontline operations and cost us more money in the future, and I believe that they are absolutely correct.

□ 1550

Now, I recognize that the administrations budget left Chairman ADERHOLT some holes to fill, but the real problem here is the bill's allocation in the budget resolution. That's thanks to a completely unrealistic spending cap set by the House Republican budget. We are now seeing the real implications of that deeply flawed plan. It simply leaves no room to keep departmental operations strong, and at the same time to fund our dual responsibility to prepare for and respond to all hazards.

The majority further exacerbated the allocation's inadequacy by adding \$850 million in disaster relief beyond the President's request to respond to recent flooding and tornado emergencies. Now, that's fine; that's important to do. But contrary to bipartisan tradition, the additional spending was not designated as an emergency for budget purposes, and as a result these disaster funds come out of the hide of first responder funding.

We gave the majority two chances to correct this flaw by designating the funding increase, that is, the increase beyond the President's request, as an emergency, once in last week's appropriation committee markup and yesterday in the Rules Committee. Unfortunately, the majority refused and passed up the opportunity to get us to a point where both parties might be able to support this bill.

I want to close by reiterating my appreciation for the chairman's efforts, for the staff's efforts to work with us on many, many issues in this bill, and for their valiant efforts to sustain our frontline Federal homeland security operations; but the bill does fall short of our obligations in critical aspects. The inadequate allocation makes it difficult to repair this bill, but I and other Members will be offering amendments to move it in a positive direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ala-

bama about some concerns about the Chemical Facilities Antiterrorism Standards, known as CFATS.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has voted by more than two-thirds to favorably report to the House a bill to extend authorization for CFATS through fiscal year 2017. Our bill also contains authorizations for appropriations for the full 7 years, and that provision conforms to the majority leader's CutGo protocols. I recognize the need to fund the CFATS program for the next fiscal year, but I'm hoping that the gentleman will provide me with an indication of his support for the authorizing committee to get its job done on this matter.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I would be happy to. And I congratulate the Energy and Commerce Committee on pursuing the CFATS authorization on an expedited basis this year. We do hope and expect that CFATS will be authorized under regular order prior to the start of the new fiscal year. However, it was important that we include funding for the 2012 appropriation bill for CFATS, and we do not want that line item to appear to be in conflict with the currently enacted sunset date of October 4, 2011.

I look forward to a long-term authorization extension so that these chemical facilities and the people that work in them can have a long-range certainty with respect to antiterrorism plans and investments. We look forward to a good authorizing bill becoming law in time to guide our final 2012 agreements on the CFATS funding.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for his support.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of our full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I thank my friend, Ranking Member PRICE, for yielding.

I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman ROGERS, Chairman ADERHOLT and Ranking Member PRICE for their work on this bill, and to the committee staff that has worked long days and many late nights to produce the bill for our consideration today. I would also like to commend the majority's effort to accommodate many of the concerns of Members on the Democratic side. And I would also like to thank Chairmen ROGERS and ADERHOLT for bringing this bill to the floor through the regular order and working with us to bring it to the floor with a rule that allows Members to offer their amendments.

At the outset, let me state for the record that I believe the allocation for this bill is too low. The bill is about \$1.1 billion below the FY11 enacted level and \$2.9 billion below the President's request, and it would represent the second straight year of a declining Homeland Security budget.

Some parts of this bill are very good, and I commend the chairman for providing adequate funding for the front-

line employees of the Department of Homeland Security to continue to conduct critical operations along our borders, protect our airports and seaports, and to respond to the series of natural disasters we have experienced this spring. However, some serious gaps remain. My colleague, Mr. PRICE, has already described in great detail the dangerous reductions in our support for the Nation's first responders.

Also slashed in this bill is the budget for research and development activities at the Department. The bill approved by the full committee provides less than \$400 million for the Science and Technology Directorate's Research, Development, Acquisition and Operations account, a cut of more than 40 percent. At this level for 2012, S&T has informed us that many critical research efforts already under way on cybersecurity, disaster resiliency, and detection of chemical and biological threats would be halted. America's technological edge is one of our great assets, and in the fight against terrorism I believe that it would be a mistake to retreat from the aggressive pursuit of new solutions.

I also want to bring my colleagues' attention to another disturbing precedent-setting provision of this bill. It would require the President to submit a budget amendment for additional disaster relief funding 3 months before the balance of available funds reaches \$800 million, and it would require these additional funds to be fully offset from discretionary budget accounts. Certainly, Democrats as well as Republicans would like to see less reliance on supplemental appropriations to fund known disaster relief needs. But when disasters strike, victims need help and they need help quickly. We should not risk delaying disaster relief because of partisan battles over proposed offsets; nor should we create a mechanism that would tie up the relief process because a disaster did not do us the courtesy of providing 3 months' notice.

During our consideration of the bill, we will have the opportunity to address these and other serious flaws, and I am hopeful that we will be able to do so.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank Chairman ADERHOLT for the time; but, more importantly, I thank him for the great work that he has done in perfecting this bill and bringing it to the floor, along with the accolades that have already been said about the staff and the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, rise in support of this bill. When I became chairman of this committee, I promised to return to regular order, open rules, and the completion of as many appropriations bills as possible prior to the August recess; and I intend to stick by that promise. And I appreciate the

cooperation of my ranking member, Mr. DICKS, who has been very, very helpful in this process already. I look forward to an open amendment process and lively debate over the next several months.

I also vowed, Mr. Chairman, that we would cut spending wherever possible to help balance our budgets. The Appropriations Committee is dedicated to the careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars, and you will see that in each of the 12 bills we put out this year that will be a hallmark, careful stewardship of money.

We have had to make the most of our very limited resources in all areas of government, and that includes the Department of Homeland Security. We began this year with the Homeland Security appropriations bill because we can all agree that our national security is a number one priority. Every day our citizens worry about constant terrorist threats, the security of our air and seaports, and the defense of our borders; but we also face the very real dangers of uncontrolled spending and skyrocketing debt.

Americans deserve to live and work in a country that will protect not only their physical safety, but also their economic livelihood. This bill maintains the crucial measures that keep our citizens safe while also reining in out-of-control, dangerous deficit spending, providing \$40.6 billion in total emergency spending for the various programs within DHS. This is a decrease of \$1.1 billion below last year's level.

It funds the critical frontline personnel, operations and programs needed to uphold the highest levels of national security. Within this bill, we have bolstered our immigration and border security efforts, funded the maritime and security activities of the Coast Guard, and boosted security efforts to address air cargo threats.

□ 1600

The bill also addresses the President's overtly inadequate request for known disaster relief costs. It can be nearly impossible, in fact it is impossible, to plan for acts of God. But over the past few weeks, Mother Nature has wreaked havoc across our Midwest and South and other parts of the country, demonstrating the need for sufficient disaster relief funding.

I'm proud that we have added a billion dollars to the disaster relief fund while completely offsetting this increase by taking unused funding from the Department of Energy.

We've significantly reduced or eliminated ineffective and wasteful programs while requiring reforms in underperforming programs through heightened oversight to get the most out of each and every tax dollar. This includes long overdue reform on the State and local grant program under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which has been plagued by inefficiency. These grants often remain

in Federal coffers for years to come. Right now, as you've heard, there is a backlog of more than \$13 billion in unspent grant funds. Why should we pack a clogged pipe, as Chairman ADERHOLT has said, at a time when we are strapped for money as we are.

This bill reduces funding for that program by \$2.1 billion, changing the structure and requiring increased measurement and reporting, and getting the money out of the pipeline and into the hands of our first responders and our local communities and States.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. There is no money for advanced inspection technology body scanners or the staff. It prohibits funds to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to or within the U.S., and in accordance with the House rules, there are no earmarks in this bill.

The misleading budget request from the President for DHS included undefined and unspecified administrative savings and relied on \$650 million of revenue from fees Congress has not approved. This bill follows both the spirit and the letter of the law that we must make real budget cuts, and that's what we do in this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to one of our fine subcommittee members from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill which irresponsibly slashes over \$1 billion from programs that protect and support the ability of our local police, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel to quickly and adequately respond to a disaster or a terrorist attack.

The destructive flooding across the Mississippi Basin and the devastating tornadoes in Alabama and Missouri have demonstrated the need for a rapid and effective response to save lives. This is true of other parts of our country, like my home city of Los Angeles, which is vulnerable to fires and earthquakes and is one of the top 10 targets for a terrorist attack.

My police departments, firefighters, and first responders have said that the cuts in this bill will delay their implementation of a badly needed interoperable communications system, which is critical to their emergency coordination efforts.

It was the lack of this kind of technology during the 9/11 attacks that contributed to hundreds of deaths. The cuts in this bill also jeopardize the security of our Nation's ports—the Port of Los Angeles, Long Beach, for example, tells us that the cuts to port security grants would seriously threaten their ability to protect the port and to continue critical security training programs. An attack on this complex alone would have devastating consequences on our economy.

FEMA director Craig Fugate testified before our subcommittee that degrading the capabilities of State and local governments would likely magnify the impact of a disaster and ultimately increase the total costs to taxpayers.

This bill turns a blind eye to these realities. It is a dangerous bill that weakens our national security and undermines the ability of our first responders to safely meet the dangerous challenges they face every day.

America cannot cut its way to greater security. Today's realities require that our first responders and our Department of Homeland Security receive funding commensurate with the scale and the severity of the threats America faces.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2017.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2012 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. This bill cuts \$1.1 billion from last year's level and \$3 billion from the President's request while still providing the resources needed to ensure that our borders are safe and secure and our homeland is safe and secure.

All frontline defenders, including the Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, Coast Guard, military personnel, and Secret Service agents are fully funded. In fact, this measure substantially increases funding for many of these frontline defenders over the President's budget request while eliminating waste in other areas.

It ensures our borders will be secure by providing both CBP and ICE with all necessary resources. It ensures our homeland will be protected from terrorist threats by giving TSA additional funds to conduct air cargo screening. It ensures that the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, will have the flexibility of funds needed to respond to disasters, including the floods along the Mississippi River Valley, the tornadoes that have swept the Nation, and the ongoing wildfires that have devastated my home State of Texas.

This bill also includes 169 oversight actions which will force the Obama administration to be accountable to the Congress and ultimately to the people of the United States.

At a time when China owns \$1.1 trillion of our publicly held debt, we must make hard choices on spending here in D.C. during these difficult economic times, just like families across this country do every day.

I would like to commend Chairman ADERHOLT and Ranking Member PRICE for their leadership on this critical measure, and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this very important bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in support of the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

As a member of the committee from a 9/11 State, I work daily to ensure that our State and Nation are prepared to meet any and all potential Homeland Security threats, whether those threats come from natural events or from activities of violent international extremists.

One month after Osama bin Laden was brought to justice, we cannot ignore the fact that terrorists are plotting and planning at this very moment to harm Americans everywhere. They're waiting for us to let down our guard so they can attack our communities and our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, it remains a dangerous world. We must remain vigilant.

However, we must also remember that one of the greatest threats to our national security is our growing \$14.3 trillion national debt. We've heard that from our civilian and military leaders. Consequently, our subcommittee has carefully examined the President's \$43.5 billion request, and we have had to make some hard choices. I congratulate Chairman ADERHOLT and Mr. PRICE for making those choices.

□ 1610

In this context, I must say for the record I am concerned about the extent of the reductions to FEMA's State and local grant programs included in the bill. With that said, and a lot more could be said, I also recognize that we have already made substantial investments in these important areas for over 9 years.

Mr. Chairman, I support the chairman's intent to force the Department to make tough decisions on spending. It's imperative that a Department with over 230,000 employees and dozens of agencies and directorates under its jurisdiction, that they make the hard choices. This bill will ensure that the Department is accountable for taxpayers' dollars. We have witnessed the infusions of many millions of taxpayers' dollars over the last 9 years.

And, lastly, as one of the three appropriators that are liaisons to the Intelligence Committee, I note that the bill fully funds the President's requested funding increases for intelligence gathering activities at the Department of Homeland Security. I support the bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2017, the Homeland Security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012. As we all know, we are closing in on the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, and this week marks one month since the death of Osama bin Laden. Communities across the country, particularly in Ala-

bama, as ably represented by the chairman of this subcommittee, and Missouri, are reeling from some of the most devastating storms and tornadoes in their history.

I am pleased that the Homeland Security funding bill is the first of the FY12 appropriations bills to be considered on the floor this afternoon. H.R. 2017, this legislation, tackles both fiscal discipline and national security, both of critical importance to the American public.

With regard to fiscal responsibility, H.R. 2017 provides \$40.6 billion in discretionary funding, or almost \$3 billion, or 7 percent, below the request, and \$1.1 billion, or 3 percent, below the fiscal year 2011 level.

As for our national security, all of our front line personnel, including Border Patrol agents, CBP officers, ICE agents, and Coast Guard military personnel are fully funded to sustain their forces and meet mission objectives. Obviously, we wish we could do more in this legislation, but I think this is a very important start that should move this process forward.

Furthermore, this bill, 2017, does not shy away from oversight to ensure the Federal Government is a good steward of the American public's tax dollars. For instance, the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, will be required to cap their full-time screeners and generate a plan to improve the integration of screening technology and the deployment of its existing workforce. Having served on the authorizing committee for 6 years, I very much appreciate this initiative and have paid very close attention to these TSA issues over the years.

I do believe this bill we are considering today is timely and specifically targets our Nation's security needs. I know that we are going to have a robust debate on some of these amendments that can further enhance this legislation.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman ADERHOLT for his hard work and his leadership, as well as the minority staff.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Let me just at the outset commend him for his professionalism and his courtesy throughout this entire process, and also for the effort that he made to preserve the Secure the Cities program in the Homeland Security bill. Having said that, I must reluctantly oppose the bill in its current form.

Mr. Chairman, the threat level is the highest in our country since 9/11. That has only been increased since the death of Osama bin Laden. Osama bin Laden specifically stated, we find in his documents, that he wanted to attack mass transit, wanted to attack maritime shipping. Yet we are reducing our mass transit security funding by 50 percent. We are reducing our port security fund-

ing by 50 percent. We are reducing overall aid for Homeland Security grants, which was the purpose for which the Department was created. We are reducing that by 50 percent. This, I believe, is putting us at risk.

I can speak, for instance, for New York. We have 5 million people, 5 million passengers every day on our subway system, hundreds of thousands on the commuter lines; yet we are cutting security by 50 percent. We have a thousand police officers working on counterterrorism, carrying out a Federal purpose, doing not what they were doing before September 11, but working entirely on counterterrorism and intelligence. Yet their funding will be significantly cut.

We have the Lower Manhattan Security Initiative, which is going to provide a camera system of protection in the Lower Manhattan area. And I can go through program after program. Every penny is accounted for. And I would say that as we go forward, as we look to the future, it's important that cities and governments have some sense of continuity of where the funding will come from as they put their programs in place. To have a 50 percent cut this year is going to put us at a severe disadvantage.

And as we do approach the 10th anniversary of September 11, do we really want to cut our police departments, our counterterrorism units, our intelligence units, our mass transit security, our port security by 50 percent? To me, this is an invitation to an attack. We cannot put ourselves in that position. Because of that, despite my great regard for the chairman, I must reluctantly oppose this legislation.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of increased funding for important state and local grant programs which have been irresponsibly slashed in this bill.

This bill consolidates nine distinct grant programs into one and cuts the overall funding level by 55 percent from FY 2011 levels.

This bill cuts programs that our communities rely on to detect and prevent terrorism, train emergency responders, secure transit and ports, and address other critical needs.

Have the threats our communities face diminished by 55 percent in the past year?

No.

In fact, in the past few months we have dealt with numerous natural disasters—tsunamis, tornadoes, and floods.

Early today, 40 Honolulu Firefighters were called to extinguish a fire that damaged three businesses in Hawaii—which they did successfully.

And even with the death of Osama Bin Laden, we all know that we must remain vigilant against the likelihood of possible terrorist attacks.

If anything, we should be increasing funding for detecting, preventing, and responding to these types of threats.

Instead, the majority's cut and consolidate proposal will undermine Hawaii's preparedness. This bill will prevent Hawaii from receiving Urban Area Security Initiative funds, which have been crucial to our ability to detect and guard against terrorist attacks, and prepare for natural and man-made disasters.

Additionally, port and transit security funds received a combined \$500 million in FY 2011. Under this “cut and consolidate” proposal, these programs now must compete with seven other programs for a total allocation of \$1 billion.

This bill as written fails to adequately address a key objective of the Department of Homeland Security—ensuring that our nation is prepared for unforeseen emergencies.

The National Association of Counties also opposes this “cut and consolidate” approach. I request that a letter I received from the Association outlining its concerns be included in the RECORD.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting amendments like this one and providing adequate resources to keep our communities safe.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,  
May 25, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,  
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS: On behalf of National Association of Counties (NACo) and the elected and appointed officials we represent from our nation's 3068 counties, we write to urge you to protect essential public safety funding for our communities as you debate the FY2012 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appropriations bill on the House floor soon. Specifically, we strongly urge you to fund DHS State and Local Programs, Fire Grants, SAFER Grants at FY 2010 or even 2011 levels. Additionally, we ask that you oppose efforts to consolidate DHS State and local programs into a single line item and allow future grant awards to be distributed at the discretion of the DHS Secretary.

Currently, these programs assist States, local governments and public safety agencies in securing our borders, enforcing our immigration laws, improving our nation's preparedness, prevention, response, and recovery from all hazard threats. Furthermore, these programs have assisted in expanding regional collaboration at all levels of government and public safety disciplines, strengthening information sharing, enhancing interoperable communications capabilities, supporting medical surge and mass prophylaxis capabilities and increasing citizen preparedness.

Since September 11, all communities—of all sizes have had to enhance their level of preparedness to deal with all hazards threats, including potential nuclear, chemical, and/or biological attacks. This effort has continued and requires a great deal of state and local planning, coordination and investment by all stakeholders. Recent and past natural catastrophic disasters affecting our states and local communities and intelligence that showcases foreign terrorists' willingness to target both large and small communities further strengthens our resolve that now is not the time to reduce or consolidate these critical programs.

While we understand the severity of the federal budget challenges that must be addressed, we strongly believe it is imperative that we remain vigilant about meeting our public safety commitments to our nation's citizens. States and local governments can only achieve the highest level of prepared-

ness, response and recovery if the federal government properly continues to fund these critical programs. Preserving these funds will continue to aid state and local governments in our efforts to implement statewide and regional strategies, provide necessary resources to our first responders, and enhance basic levels of prevention and preparedness across the nation. Thank you for your consideration, and we again urge you to protect essential public safety funding for our communities as you begin deliberations.

Sincerely,

B. GLEN WHITLEY,  
President, National  
Association of Counties.

LARRY E. NAAKE,  
Executive Director,  
National Association  
of Counties.

Mr. PIERLUISSI. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the various amendments offered by my colleagues to either increase funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative or to maintain current funding levels but ensure that they are more fairly distributed among U.S. cities.

The amendment would strike a provision in the bill that would make more than 50 cities ineligible to receive funding under the Urban Areas Security Initiative. This discretionary grant program provides federal funding to metropolitan areas to purchase equipment, conduct exercises, develop plans, and train and compensate first responders. The funds are allocated to high-risk urban areas based on vulnerability and threat assessments conducted by DHS.

In the case of Puerto Rico, the City of San Juan received \$3.1 million in funding through this program in 2010. These resources have allowed law enforcement and emergency responders in San Juan to prepare for national security incidents, without compromising other parts of their missions. If San Juan loses access to these funds, it may be forced to shift money that it had allocated to combat crime to address its counter-terrorism needs instead. This is a choice that the City should not be compelled to make.

Indeed, it is illogical to eliminate funding for certain high risk urban areas, like San Juan, just because other cities have a higher risk. All high risk urban areas should receive funding proportional to their relative risk assessment. And this is exactly how funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative is currently divided. In 2011, the 11 highest risk urban areas were eligible for \$540 million, while the next 20 highest risk urban areas were eligible for \$122 million. This allocation—where the very highest risk areas receive greater funding than other high risk areas—makes sense and should be continued.

To leave San Juan, San Antonio, and Syracuse to their own devices, while devoting all funding under this program to larger cities that already receive robust federal and local support is not prudent.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan, budget-neutral amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2017

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$126,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$60,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses, of which \$20,000 shall be made available to the Office of Policy for Visa Waiver Program negotiations in Washington, DC, and for other international activities: *Provided further*, That consistent with the requirements specified within Presidential Policy Directive-8, dated March 30, 2011, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than October 15, 2011, the National Preparedness Goal and not later than January 15, 2012, the National Preparedness System: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$63,350,000 may not be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive (1) the National Preparedness Goal and the National Preparedness System consistent with Presidential Policy Directive-8, and (2) the Secretary's determination on implementation of biometric air exit.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$63,350,000”.

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$117,470,000”.

Page 4, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$139,180,000”.

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$55,672,000”.

Page 4, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$83,508,000”.

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$320,000,000”.

Page 50, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$135,000,000”.

Page 50, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$185,000,000”.

Mr. LATOURETTE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. LATOURETTE. First of all, I want to indicate that I am offering this amendment with my friend and neighbor. Actually, he is in the office next door, Mr. PASCRELL of New Jersey. And this deals with the Fire and the SAFER grant programs. I also want to indicate that I have nothing but respect for the full committee chairman and the subcommittee chairman, who have been dealt a difficult hand with the 302(b) allocations made in front of them, and as they face the awesome responsibility of funding the programs that defend our country.

However, the Chair I think may remember during the discussion of the continuing resolution in H.R. 1 that there was some discussion about what funding levels were appropriate for fiscal year 2011 for these two grant programs which aid our first responders. In the one iteration of H.R. 1, there was something along the lines of a 75 percent reduction from these funds. Those funds, however, were restored by overwhelming votes of the whole body. Over 300 Members supported Mr. PASCRELL's amendment to put the level back up at \$820 million for fiscal year 2011, and just shy of 260 Members supported Mr. PRICE of North Carolina's amendment that dealt with how those funds could be utilized and spent.

□ 1620

Now, again, faced with the difficult decisions that the chairs find themselves in, the average reduction, and this isn't a bill that came to the floor with across-the-board cuts, but the average reduction in spending is about 14 percent for the bills that the Appropriations Committee is considering. Yet these funds have gone from \$820 million to \$350 million, which is on the order of about a, well, 60 percent reduction.

The amendment that I offer with Mr. PASCRELL would transfer funds out of the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer to restore those funds not to the \$820 million that 300 Members of the House indicated should be spent in the last fiscal year, but restores them to \$670 million equally divided between the two programs that I have indicated.

Now, at that level, these funds will still receive a 19 percent reduction from fiscal year 2011 and, again, citing my great respect for the chairs of the committee, on more than one occasion I have heard it remarked that this is a national Homeland Security bill and there needs to be some nexus between this funding and a national purpose, that we should not be in the business of funding every local and/or volunteer

fire department in the Nation, and I agree with that sentiment.

However, I can just tell you that faced with amazing budget pressures back in our local communities, when the Grand River in Painesville, Ohio, flooded a couple of years ago, it wasn't FEMA, it wasn't the Coast Guard, it wasn't the National Guard that plucked these folks out of their homes and plucked them out of the river and saved their lives and saved their properties. It was our firefighters and our police officers.

So if we make a determination as a Congress that we are in the FEMA business—that is, emergency management business—and we will provide funds to help rebuild and reshape and fortify and all the other things, then we need to be in all parts of the emergency management business, and that includes the first responder portion of that.

Therefore, I know that we have attempted to come to some agreement on this amendment to try and get all parties on board. Sadly, we haven't been able to do that, not for lack of trying on the part of the chairman. But we find ourselves now with this simple amendment that transfers funds from the bureaucracy of the Department of Homeland Security and restores it to our local communities and our first responders.

Again, I want to thank Mr. PASCRELL for his cosponsorship. I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reluctantly oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. As I mentioned, I reluctantly rise to oppose this amendment, which would slash the funding for the Department's management functions below what is responsible for the Nation's security and move funding to the grants.

I was hoping that we would be able to work something out on this, but it was not possible. The committee has already cut the Department's headquarters management at historic levels. In fact, the bill reduces the funding for these activities 21 percent below what the President requested himself.

This includes zeroing out the Department's new headquarters in Washington, D.C., zeroed out the funding for data center migration, and we have slashed other initiatives we cannot afford at this time. Many of these cuts were unavoidable because the President's budget request for the Department of Homeland Security was filled with phony offsets.

Since 9/11, Congress has provided \$6.7 billion for this program and for the last 3 years has included a waiver for the cost share requirements with local governments. Given our Nation's dire fiscal situation, we must take a stand that it's not the Federal Government's job to bail out every municipal budget

or to serve as a fire marshal for every city and town across the Nation. In today's fiscally constrained environment, the 350 million that we have included in here is a lot of money.

Again, while I support the gentleman's intentions, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. First, I want to thank Mr. LATOURETTE for, as usual, taking on a very, very exquisite subject here and not coming late to the fight. So I am proud to rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment. I want to thank my good friend from Ohio for his leadership and willingness to work across the aisle on this important issue.

To those who say that the Federal Government bears no responsibility about public safety, they are absolutely wrong. On one side of our mouth we say that we must protect and defend our first responders; on the other side of our mouth we say that we have no responsibility whatsoever in talking about our firefighters and our police officers. And that is why, just a short period of time ago in the 2011 CR, both sides came together. The majority of both parties supported putting money back into the budget.

We are debating a bill called the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. It's an ironic title because this legislation, as written, fails the American people and fails the very people who are on front lines of our homeland security. It is our firefighters and our police officers who will respond to a national tragedy before the Federal Government. This is what we said in 9/11. This is what we said in every year since 9/11, and it has not changed.

We understand the financial realities this country faces, and I am prepared to work across the aisle to find common solutions as we did 6 months ago. But what we cannot afford is to sacrifice our country's security at the altar of spending cuts, and that's precisely what the bill, as written now, does.

The FIRE and SAFER programs, these programs, supported by both Democrats and Republicans, reached across the lines, across that center aisle that goes down between us, and said let's work together on the national security of this country. Remember, the FIRE Act was written before 9/11 when places in the far west had to push their equipment to a fire. Simply put, that's not acceptable in the United States of America, the greatest country in the world.

And when we ask our first responders to be ready, to protect us, to protect the community, we need to know that they have the resources necessary. And, as you know, not only in the past

several years have our local communities been unable, small and large communities, to have all of those resources at their hands, now it's even more difficult. What you are asking here is a cut of 57 percent compared to the 2010 and 2011 budget. Unacceptable.

I support adequate funding for all of the agencies funded in this bill, but we are shortchanging the very people who ran into the burning buildings on September 11. You can't tell me those folks weren't on the front lines that day. I don't believe you if that's what you are telling me, and I know you don't mean that, but then don't say it.

The FIRE Act was signed by President Clinton before September 11. We are talking about basic equipment needs for our fire departments to protect all of our constituents, and hasn't that changed since 9/11. What their responsibilities are and what they need to respond to is much different than 9/11.

September 11 changed the relationship we had with our first responders, solidified our decision that no longer would this funding be a solely local issue. Firefighters and police officers are an integral part of homeland security, and ensuring they are well staffed and equipped would be partly a Federal responsibility.

□ 1630

Since they were originally authorized back in 2000, these programs have provided nearly \$7 billion to our local fire departments in nearly every congressional district in this country. The fact is that our firefighters rely on this funding for the equipment, for the training and for the personnel, especially in these tough economic times.

An independent evaluation of the FIRE program, Mr. Chairman, published by the U.S. Fire Administration, concluded it was highly effective in improving the readiness. And this is the most efficient Federal program in the entire Federal budget. Hear me.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in qualified support of the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment. The bill before us more than halves the total amount of funding for firefighter assistance grants compared to 2011 and 2010.

If this bill is adopted as written, the hiring grants known as SAFER grants are going to be cut by 63 percent below 2011, and equipment grants will be cut by 51 percent. That is simply unacceptable. These cuts would result in thousands of fewer firefighters on the job. It would leave fewer departments able to maintain safe staffing levels. It would prevent many fire departments from purchasing equipment, purchasing breathing apparatus and protective

gear that our firefighters depend on during a time of emergency.

This bipartisan amendment provides \$320 million to restore this funding to the President's requested level. Mind you, that's still below the 2011 level, but it comes at least to the President's requested level. And it would divide the funds between SAFER and equipment grants as we've been urged to do by the various fire associations.

Retaining this funding when local governments are cutting firefighter budgets will help preserve public safety and security. This amendment will help keep thousands of firefighters on the job.

And the notion that we are talking here about some kind of Federal takeover of local security responsibilities, I think everyone in this Chamber knows that that is not an accurate characterization of what's going on here. Of course, these expenditures are still mainly occurring at the local level, but we're in a world where our fire departments are being asked to equip themselves in new ways, to train themselves in new ways, to meet new kinds of threats and hazards, and these FIRE grants—the personnel grants and the equipment grants—have been a critical way of establishing a partnership whereby our local fire departments can do what they need to do in this new era when they confront all kinds of new hazards.

Now, I don't believe the offsets in this amendment are workable at the end of the day. I want to acknowledge that. But the inadequate Republican budget allocation, combined with the decision to transfer \$850 million from first responder grants to disaster relief and to refuse emergency designation for disaster relief leaves my colleagues no good place to cut and no good options to find offsets for the absolutely essential restoring of these grants to firefighters.

So I support the amendment, but I will work diligently to restore these funding cuts as the bill progresses; and we will get down, at the end of day, I trust, to responsible budget negotiations with the Senate and the White House.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment, and I too recognize the challenges that Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. PRICE faced in the confines of trying to address some difficult times. But as a Member of the Homeland Security Committee, I believe it is imperative that we look at the reality of the world in which we live. In an article dated April 24, 2011, out of the State of Texas, reads: hundreds of weary firefighters were racing against the clock on Sunday, pushing

back massive brush fires that have destroyed near-record swatches of Texas countryside. Firefighters were hoping to make as much progress as possible before low humidity and strong winds set the stage for more potential flare-ups late Monday and Tuesday.

Fires were still burning in Texas. Firefighters are still being called upon. Cities and States across America are laying off firefighters. And we are reminded of the needs, if you will, that were addressed on 9/11 when firefighters from the City of New York rushed in to save their fellow New Yorkers and others, and many of them, many of them perished.

They are, in fact, first responders. And I believe it is important that we make the sacrifice, we find the adequate offset, and we support this amendment. I'm also reminded of a story that many of you may have heard, the sad story, it aired on local television, where firefighters from some locality watched while a man drowned and could not save him. The reasoning was that the particular team that would have had the skills and the equipment to save this drowning man in what has been called the most powerful Nation in the world, was fired, laid off, eliminated. And, therefore, from the shoreline many looked in horror as this particular man drowned.

Is this what America has come to?

I believe this amendment is extremely important, one, to be able to show appreciation to the firefighters across America who come to the aid of those in need from different States when a crisis or tragedy occurs.

I heard someone mention, it might have been Mr. LATOURETTE, but who is it that plucks you out of a burning house or rescues, when they do have the resources or the team, out of a predicament where you are stranded in some crisis, whether it is drowning, whether it's a fire, whether it is an emergency health condition or whether or not they are confronting a terrorist act? Firefighters are truly our first responders.

In the City of Houston they are considering closing out or shutting down 600-plus police officers. And firefighters have the same concerns.

So I think it is very important that we own up to our duties. And as I mentioned in a metaphor before, let the American people be winners today. Let the firefighters be present and accounted for. And let us be reminded of their great heroic acts of 9/11. This 10th year anniversary, let us not say thank you in the way that we deny them funding, but let us say thank you in the way that we provide them with the funding that they need.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, as

well, for several reasons. Number one, it's very obvious that our first responders, our firefighters, they are the first there to take care of the public when a natural disaster such as these tornadoes that have hit our country demolish homes and injure people.

But most importantly it is this: our local units of government right now don't have the money to properly equip and staff their firefighters. And here's why: their property values that they have depended on for their funding, well, they've been diminished because of the foreclosure crisis, a crisis that this Congress has failed to effectively address.

So there's one duty, however, that we can't turn our back on. And that's the safety of the American people. And that's why I urge you to at least partially restore funding for these important firefighter grants.

And while I may have a problem with the funding source of this amendment, I will tell you the appropriate way to fund our first responders, firefighters, police officers and emergency medical providers, take a share of the military aid that's going to Afghanistan right now; bin Laden is gone. We need to reassess our mission in Afghanistan and redirect some of that money to protect Americans right here at home. Let's put some of that money in the Homeland Security budget. It's our firefighters that are our first defense against a terrorist attack.

I support this amendment. We have the money. We just need to allocate it right. We've done enough in Afghanistan. Let's take some of that money and put it right here to protect the American people. Support homeland security, because the next threat that we likely will get from a terrorist will come from within our borders. Let's take care of our people right now.

□ 1640

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bill to restore funding for the Assistance to Firefighters and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant programs.

The AFG and SAFER programs are essential to our public safety and security. These programs improve the readiness of our Nation's firefighters, ensuring that the brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day for the safety of our communities are prepared with the capabilities they need to continue protecting and serving our communities safely and effectively.

These grants provided by the AFG and SAFER programs are the single most important source of Federal assistance to volunteer fire departments.

They help fire departments equip, train and maintain their personnel so they are prepared to respond to all emergencies. These programs are able to address the immediate and individualized needs of fire departments efficiently and effectively because funding is awarded directly to fire departments instead of being funneled through other layers of government bureaucracies.

As a result of the recent economic downturn and budget constraints at all levels of government, many fire departments have been forced to cut personnel and services. Without adequate funding for AFG and SAFER, thousands of firefighters could be laid off, and communities across the country could be put further at risk.

There are more than 150 fire departments in my district alone, and each one plays a critical role in keeping local communities safe. Many of these fire departments have benefited from AFG funding. Beaver Falls, Hanover, New Brighton, and Raccoon Township fire departments are just a few of the many that have used the grants to purchase new equipment or to train additional personnel.

Just this year, Berkley Hills Fire Department used an AFG grant to purchase an aerial ladder fire truck that will help the department better protect the numerous multistory apartment complexes, retirement homes and businesses in Ross Township. The West Deer Township Volunteer Fire Company also received an AFG grant this year that allowed the fire company to replace outdated equipment with new portable radios and automated external defibrillators. These upgrades will not only increase firefighter safety; they will also improve the services provided to the communities those fire departments serve.

Enacting the cuts to the AFG and SAFER programs in the underlying legislation will only make it harder for fire departments to avoid layoffs and protect our communities. By adequately funding AFG and SAFER programs, we can help volunteer fire departments nationwide obtain the equipment and personnel they need to effectively respond to emergencies. According to the International Association of Firefighters, over 1,600 firefighters could lose their jobs as a result of the funding cuts that are in this bill.

I urge all Members to support firefighters in their districts and vote in favor of increased funding for firefighters and to support the amendment of Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PASCRELL.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the Chair for allowing me to speak in support of the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment to restore funding for FIRE and SAFER grants.

I would like to thank Congressman LATOURETTE and Congressman

PASCRELL for offering this amendment that enjoys bipartisan support and which I strongly support.

The onslaught of natural disasters that we have seen all across the country has shown that the need for first responders has increased, not decreased. Many of us have been strong advocates for this program and recognize the inherent value of making sure our Nation's first responders have the people and the equipment they need in order to ensure our safety in all of our local communities.

I support these programs. Why? Because they work.

After an independent evaluation of the FIRE grant program was implemented by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture concluded that this program was "highly effective in improving the readiness and capabilities of firefighters across the Nation."

Additionally, at a time when many local and State governments have been forced to make drastic cuts to their emergency staff and personnel, the SAFER program has been the only resource fire departments have had to ensure that their communities would be ready if they needed to respond.

In the Appropriations Committee report, it mentions that FEMA should maintain an "all hazards focus" in order to ensure that FEMA concentrates its efforts on where it is needed most. I strongly agree with this sentiment, which is why I think this amendment is critical to achieving our goals.

As the Representative of the 37th Congressional District and as the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I understand the importance of having a fully staffed and equipped fire department. The San Miguel fire, the worst wildfire in California's history, burned through 90,000 acres of land and cost \$15.6 million. However, thanks to prior planning and fire prevention education efforts made possible by this critical grant program, not a single life was lost in this devastation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Unfortunately, with firefighters, we cannot always plan ahead. We have to be ready to respond, to do the rescue and then to do the recovery. This amendment should be made in order so as to eliminate the burden that our local and State governments and the firefighters feel of having to do more with less.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chair, I wish to strike the last word.

I rise today in support of an amendment to restore \$320 million in funding to the Department of Homeland Security's FIRE/SAFER grant programs that help provide firefighter jobs, equipment, and training for local fire departments.

Yesterday, I attended a rally in my district on Staten Island to save one of our fire companies, Engine 157. As it stands, New York

City's proposed budget will cut twenty fire companies from New York City—three from my district in Staten Island and Brooklyn.

While I have no vote on the City's budget, I do have vote in Congress, and I will not let the federal government turn its back on our nation's firefighters.

As a first responder during 9/11, I worked beside these brave and selfless first responders on the bucket brigade. I know how important it is to have well-equipped and well-trained firefighters when it comes to saving lives—whether they're saving victims from a major disaster or rescuing someone from a burning building.

As our nation remains on high alert, and as New York remains the number one terror target in the nation, we must remain vigilant and prepared to respond to any situation. Cutting FIRE/SAFER grants will only make that task more difficult.

Our nation's firefighters work tirelessly around the clock for our safety and protection.

They deserve our full gratitude and support, and that is why I stand today in support of restoring funding to the FIRE/SAFER grants program and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I understand the importance of cutting low-priority spending to get our budget under control. But there is nothing low-priority about the firefighters who protect our communities, our families, and our homes. Unfortunately, this appropriations bill shows badly misplaced priorities by cutting funding for the firefighters who keep us safe. Those cuts—\$320 million below the president's request—are shortsighted and reckless. They will take firefighters off the streets and put our communities at higher risk. So I support the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PASCRELL, which will restore funding for the successful FIRE and SAFER grant programs to the level requested by the president.

FIRE and SAFER help fire departments across America recruit, train, and retain skilled firefighters. They help fire departments equip themselves with the up-to-date tools they need to protect property and save lives. What do we cut when we cut FIRE and SAFER? We cut protective equipment that helps brave men and women enter burning buildings. We cut power generators that keep fire stations running and providing vital services during emergencies. We cut staffing, so that fire stations are more likely to be sitting empty or underprepared when disasters strike. Independent observers have found that FIRE and SAFER work: an independent study from the U.S. Fire Administration found that grants like these are making our fire departments more prepared and better equipped to protect our communities.

I want to make clear that I am not pleased with the offsets being used to restore this funding. However, I recognize that my colleagues were left with very few opportunities given the significant cuts made to the overall bill. I am hopeful that this will be addressed in conference with the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, fund FIRE and SAFER at the level requested by the president, and protect these vital investments in public safety.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PASCRELL to restore funds for FIRE and SAFER Grants in the FY2012 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill.

The Assistance to Firefighters (FIRE) and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant programs provide much needed support to local fire departments to help them afford critically-needed equipment and training as well as to hire additional firefighters. Funds from the FIRE and SAFER grants can be used by local fire departments to equip, train and maintain personnel, as well as to prepare them to respond to emergencies from natural disasters to terrorist attacks. These programs address the immediate, individualized needs of departments efficiently and effectively.

Unfortunately, the FY2012 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill slashes these critical programs by almost 50 percent the amount requested in the President's budget, an amount that was already lower than previous year's funding. I concur with Mr. PRICE's sentiments that these cuts "break faith with the states and localities that depend on us as partners to secure [and protect] our communities." In fact on Sunday alone, the Texas Forest Service responded to 20 fires consuming over 1,370 acres. This is in addition to three large ongoing fires that have consumed over 1,000 acres across Texas.

While our State and Federal agencies are working together to battle this inferno, we need to ensure that fire fighters have the equipment and resources that they need.

As local governments continue to face difficult times, these Federal grants help ensure that our communities continue to have the funds to hire and retain firefighters and purchase the equipment necessary to keep our communities safe. The FIRE grant program has provided over \$7 billion in funding to local fire departments across the country since it's authorization in FY2001. One of the most recent grants awarded to El Paso, Texas, which I represent, was over \$1 million to help offset the costs of constructing new fire stations across our quickly expanding city which has welcomed over 20,000 additional soldiers.

Indeed, the FIRE and SAFER grants are a critical piece to our security efforts, and I'm proud to say that I have supported legislation to strengthen these programs to ensure that communities facing financial hardship are able to apply for funds.

The LaTourette/Pascrell Amendment restores funding to the FIRE and SAFER Grants, and the spending increase is offset by cutting other funding.

I urge my colleagues to support our fire fighters by voting in favor of this amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$336,000,000)".

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$337,000,000)".

Mr. CICILLINE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we suspend the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. This amendment is offered by me, along with my colleagues Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, Ms. MATSUI of California, Ms. BERKLEY of Nevada, and Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

I rise to offer this amendment that restores funding for State and local grants, which includes funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative, which is referred to as UASI.

This bill makes dangerous cuts to the Urban Areas Security Initiative, the UASI program, which is a program critical to the security of cities that have been deemed at high risk of terrorist attack. One of those cities is Providence, Rhode Island, in my congressional district, along with more than 50 other urban areas in our country.

Just last year, the Providence area was one of 64 cities with either critical assets or geography that was identified by Homeland Security experts as being most at risk of being targeted by terrorists. As a result, the city of Providence and other communities across this country have received critical Federal funding under UASI to support efforts to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and other emergencies. Providence also became the first city in America to have an accredited Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security.

However, the cuts that are proposed in this legislation will cripple the ability of cities to effectively ensure proper safety should an attack occur. The elimination of the UASI program means that staff will not be able to attend critical training, maintain certifications or purchase the equipment necessary to be prepared. Thousands of devices, like security cameras and radios and projects such as port sirens and watercraft, will not be able to be maintained. Emergency Operations Centers will not be able to be constructed or maintained.

□ 1650

These are urgent, urgent priorities for America's cities. Mr. Chairman, we cannot in good conscience spend billions of dollars protecting people all over the world at the expense of our own national security.

I urge Members to adopt this amendment.

I yield to my colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to echo his sentiments. I rise in support of my joint amendment with Congressman CICILLINE to restore \$337 million to the Urban Areas Security Initiative grants program, which would fund the program at the FY 2010 level.

In my home State of Rhode Island, a counterterrorism fusion center, regional cyber defense measures, and chemical, biological, and nuclear detection assets support response efforts across southern New England. A Level I trauma center and the Port of Providence are also critical assets for the region. These homeland defense capabilities are in jeopardy, however, due to the cuts to the Urban Areas Security Initiative grant program in this bill.

The UASI grants were specifically designed to make sure that densely populated areas with critical assets were adequately funded and protected. Now, because of the cuts in this program, this is an example of what I believe are an irresponsible and arbitrary approach to budget cutting that jeopardizes safety throughout the region in case of an attack or natural disaster.

So I applaud my colleague and look forward to working with him on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the Cicilline-Langevin amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island, which I am a proud cosponsor. This amendment will help protect our nation's most vulnerable cities and help effectively prevent and manage emergency situations in cities around the country.

Funding for Urban Area Security Initiative helps cities prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from disasters, including terrorism.

My district in Minnesota has benefitted greatly from the assistance of UASI. My district includes Minneapolis, a city that has been listed as one of the 31 most vulnerable cities by the UASI grant program and has received funding for projects to improve safety and response.

UASI Grant program funding has been essential to the ability of the City of Minneapolis to manage events such as the 35W Bridge collapse, the 2008 Republican National Convention and the response to the 2009 and 2011 Minneapolis tornadoes.

The UASI program has secured the metropolitan area's water supply, improved its emergency dispatch system, and provided protective gear for first responders. It also created special response teams for emergencies involving hazardous materials, the collapse of buildings and advanced bomb squads.

UASI grant dollars have paid for much of the technology associated with the city's new combined Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and first responder training facility providing real time situational awareness and communication capabilities that did not exist before.

Without these operations, the recent tornadoes in my district would have created confu-

sion and chaos in the aftermath. The speedy and effective response by the city is directly related to the funding they have received through UASI grants.

Without these important investments, public warnings and communications, disaster response, and first responder training will be compromised.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that all American cities with real security needs continue to have access to UASI funding.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today was born out of the need for reform. It consolidates various grant programs and provides discretion to the Secretary. These reforms include funding reductions, requirements for measurement, and requirements for spending languishing dollars.

In total, this bill provides \$1.7 billion for Homeland Security first responder grants. However, as we are all aware, not all programs are funded at the previous year's level.

The consolidation in this bill requires the Secretary to examine the intelligence and risk and put scarce dollars where they are most needed, whether it is a port, rail, surveillance, or access and hardening projects—or whether it is to high-risk urban areas or to States—as opposed to reverse engineering projects to fill the amount designated for one of many programs.

Additionally, as noted by the gentleman from Rhode Island, the bill limits the Urban Areas Security Initiative grants to the top 10 highest cities. Again, this puts scarce dollars where they are most needed. This does not mean lower risk cities will lose all funding; it just means the funds will come from other programs such as State Homeland grants that are risk and formula based.

These cuts will not be easy, but they are long overdue and necessary to address our out-of-control Federal spending.

Furthermore, the offset proposed by the gentleman is unacceptable. A reduction to the Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology account would: impact operations and maintenance on the border fence; reduce investments in critical border security communications; and affect the Border Patrol's ability to procure proven technologies to increase border security immediately.

I urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline, and I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me state it very plainly:

We need to increase funding for Urban Areas Security Initiative grants, UASI grants, to a minimum of the 2011 level of \$725 million. I offered amendments in full committee and asked for a waiver from the Rules Committee in order to do just that.

Now, the majority has taken over \$2.2 billion appropriated for these grant programs in 2011 and has consolidated them into a block grant of \$1 billion. If you take that \$1 billion, which includes all of these State and local grants, and then you reduce this for the statutory carve-outs, and then you reduce it again, assuming the minimum statutory funding for the States, what is going to be left? There is going to be half a billion dollars for UASI, for ports, for rail, for transit, and for other key grants all together. This is simply not enough.

Unfortunately, the proposed offset is also unacceptable. This bill, just like the 2011 final CR, greatly reduced fencing, infrastructure, and technology projects to secure our borders. While some of this reduction is due to a termination of the SBInet contract, this proposed additional cut would prevent CBP from acquiring off-the-shelf technology to support our Border Patrol along the southwest border, as well as to conduct pilot projects on our northern border. So the offset would be a damaging reduction.

But this simply illustrates the impossible dilemma posed by this bill. The root problem is an inadequate allocation, and it is compounded by the majority's refusal to call an emergency an emergency.

So I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his initiative to address the dangerous gap left by the majority's bill when it comes to protecting our Nation's urban areas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The intention of this amendment is to restore funding to the Urban Areas Security Initiative, or as we call it, UASI.

In my district of Sacramento, California, funding from the UASI program has gone to critical counterterrorism initiatives, giving law enforcement officials and first responders the tools and training to protect our community.

Sacramento is the capital of California, the most populous State in the Union and the seventh largest economy in the world. It is critical to continue to support the antiterrorist work being done there, and it is unacceptable to leave this region without appropriate funds for protection. With potential targets like the Folsom Dam, which is upstream of the city of Sacramento, key transportation systems, and numerous State and Federal facilities, UASI funding for the Sacramento region ensures protection from attacks

and cooperation among local, State, and Federal agencies.

Not receiving UASI funds would devastate one of the Nation's most proficient counter-terrorist and readiness task forces, located at the former McClellan Air Force Base in my district. This facility creates greater collaboration and communication among State and Federal law enforcement and first responders.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will bolster our Nation's security by giving our communities the tools and training necessary to keep us safe. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chair, this bill represents a gross abdication of our shared responsibility with our state and local governments to provide for the safety and security of our constituents and our communities.

Cuts to the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response, or SAFER, grants and the Assistance to Firefighters, or FIRE, grants will be devastating for communities in each of our home states. In addition, changes to the Urban Areas Security Initiative will put our high-risk communities at further risk.

As we prepare to mark the 10th anniversary of the attacks of 9/11 later this year, the wounds are still fresh in the memory in my home community of Northern Virginia. This bill will actually cut by more than 50 percent the very public safety assistance Congress deemed essential, on a bipartisan basis, to address public safety and security concerns in our communities as a result of those terrorist attacks.

How is that providing for the homeland security? I would argue that we're actually putting it at risk.

The threat of a terrorist attack has not dissipated. In fact, it probably has increased since U.S. forces killed Osama bin Laden earlier this spring.

In the wake of 9/11, we identified significant shortfalls in our public safety capabilities. Congress created these grant programs to help our cities and counties meet the demands for interoperable communication, hazardous materials response and other recommendations from local, state and federal threat assessments, including the 9/11 commission.

Still today, thousands of fire stations, both career and volunteer, across the country do not have sufficient staffing to adequately protect their communities. Many still do not have the ability to respond to all-hazards emergencies or communicate with one another.

The SAFER and FIRE grants help provide staffing, training and equipment to public safety agencies in every state. As the former Chairman of the largest local government in the National Capital Region and the Chairman of the region's Emergency Preparedness Council, I know firsthand how critical these funds are to ensure the safety of our communities.

Even before the recession, local governments had difficulties meeting their public safety needs, and now many have been forced to cut back on those services as their budgets are still reeling from the affects of the Great Recession. The reductions proposed by this legislation will only exacerbate the problem and further delay, if not gravely harm, our preparedness efforts.

Mr. Chair, we came together in a bipartisan fashion to turn back similar cuts in the Continuing Resolution for the current fiscal year, and I urge my colleagues to once again stand alongside our firefighters and public safety personnel in support of this critical funding.

Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LATOURETTE are once again offering a bipartisan amendment that would restore most of the requested grant funding. While the amendment does not preserve the entire funding request, it ensures that our local and state partners do not bear a further undue burden because the federal government is not living up to its own responsibility.

If this bill is supposed to represent our Homeland Security values, then it's done a pretty poor job by turning its back on those sworn to protect us on the front lines, namely the firefighters, police officers and other first responders in our communities. I urge my colleagues to either restore this funding or reject this attack on our basic public safety.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment supported by Chairman LAMAR SMITH, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The reason he and I are in support of this is because this amendment reduces the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management account by \$1 million and increases funding for immigration and customs enforcement by \$1 million in order to facilitate new agreements under the 287(g) program. This bill, this amendment, will provide for better enforcement of our immigration laws.

□ 1700

287(g) has been very successful. It allows State and local law enforcement agencies to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security to enforce immigration law. It was enacted back in 1996, and Congress implemented this program to give local communities help with illegal immigration in their area.

A couple of points I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. There are maybe 5,000, 6,000 ICE agents in the United States. There are 650,000 State and local law enforcement officers—650,000. So the 10 million to 12 million illegal aliens in the country are much more likely to come into contact with local law enforcement than they are with an ICE agent. And for local law enforcement, it's important that they be properly trained so that they don't profile, don't discriminate, but properly identify those here illegally who are breaking our laws.

Now, there is a backlog of cities that want 287(g) agreements, and what this legislation does is assist in covering that problem. One of the reasons so many cities want to be involved in this is because criminal alien gangs generally victimize people in the cities, often are victimizing other immigrants, often victimize legal immigrants. And, frankly, law enforcement should be trained in how to identify and remove criminal aliens, and this assists in that.

It's a great force multiplier for ICE. It provides ICE with assistance such as following up on leads and performing investigative research and surveillance. It's had a positive effect on the workload for ICE by identifying removable aliens, and it gives ICE greater flexibility in directing its immigration law enforcement resources.

Now, I want to make another point here. The CBO scores this amendment as costing zero in budget authority. Also, I think we should reflect on the fact that given that one of the 9/11 hijackers, Mohammed Atta, was pulled over in traffic 2 days before the 9/11 attack, there is a significant benefit to checking the immigration status of all individuals who are arrested. Had the officer inquired about Atta, he then could have found out that Atta was in the country illegally and may well have prevented his participation in the attacks. That is one of the benefits of having local law enforcement trained in this area.

I also want to make an additional point. This brings tens of thousands of local law enforcement to help enforce our immigration laws. There are now 70 jurisdictions with these agreements, but many more communities want help. The 287(g) program also provides training to State and local police, giving them additional tools that they can use to prosecute crimes committed by illegal immigrants, especially gang violence and document fraud.

Over the last few years, the open borders lobby has been successful in getting the administration to curtail the use of this program. Well, the 287(g) program is a solid improvement in terms of enforcing immigration laws. Particularly with the gang activity that we have today, with the drug lords sending local gangs across the border in order to participate in crimes here, it is very clear that we need this kind of a program.

Before it was created, many illegal immigrants stopped by State and local law enforcement went free. Immigration laws were not enforced. Since the program was developed, it's helped the State and local law enforcement not only fight crime, as I've indicated, but get the gang leaders, get the serious criminals off the streets and enforce our laws.

So instead of curtailing the program, we should be promoting the expansion of it. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help local communities to enforce our immigration laws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The bill before us provides full funding for the Department's request for the 287(g) program, and \$1 million more simply is not needed.

The increase proposed by the gentleman comes at the expense of the Secretary for Homeland Security, an account which is already significantly reduced in this bill and will likely be reduced further, based on amendments that we have seen already. Further cuts in these accounts would eliminate key staffing positions, limiting the Department's ability to respond to national emergencies and to provide for stable leadership in the event of a large disaster or a terrorist attack.

I should also note that while this bill slashes funding for many worthwhile and needed Homeland Security programs that support first responders, it cuts Homeland Security research, much-needed research. But the bill piles more funding onto immigration enforcement. In fact, it adds \$28 million in unrequested funding for immigration detention and removal.

Now, the bill provides full funding for the Secure Communities program to continue expanding this program across the country, allowing Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, to identify criminal aliens who are in local custody. I bring up the Secure Communities program because it accomplishes the objectives of the 287(g) program but much more efficiently and without deputizing local police to enforce immigration law, a proposition that is rife with complications and potential abuses. So if we were really serious about deficit reduction and efficiency, we would tell ICE to transition out of this duplicative program, 287(g), and to concentrate on making Secure Communities work efficiently and fairly and well to identify and remove convicted criminal aliens.

I'd also like to note for my colleagues that GAO and the Inspector General have reviewed the 287(g) program, in some cases at our subcommittee's request; and they found serious flaws in the implementation of this program and in ICE's ability to oversee its operation in local communities. The IG found 33 major deficiencies in 287(g) last year and then found 16 more when it recently reassessed the program.

So this is an unwise and unneeded amendment, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR  
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Home-

land Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), \$234,940,000, of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and \$16,686,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for the Human Resources Information Technology program.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 24, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 25, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman. I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Homeland Security Committee, tragically, since the formation of the select committee and then ultimately the full committee.

For many of us who were here in the United States Congress and watched the plane attack the Pentagon and ultimately visited Ground Zero in the early stages are well aware of the need to protect America. As the ranking member of the Transportation Security Committee, working with my colleague from Alabama, the chairman, we well recognize the importance of transportation facilities and modes.

For some reason, terrorists are attracted to airlines and freeways and trains. So this amendment is a very simple amendment that I believe provides security to the American public.

□ 1710

It was no doubt that after the killing of Osama bin Laden discovered papers suggested that al Qaeda operatives were considering attacking the U.S. rail system on the 10-year anniversary of the September 11 attacks. Yes, it was 2010, but if we recall, we were unaware that we were going to be attacked on 9/11. Los Angeles MTA planned security upgrades in response to bin Laden's killing and the discovery of rail attack plans. That is the American public's sensitivity, that we must protect our modes of transportation.

My amendment is a simple amendment that restores \$5 million to the Transportation Security account at the President's submitted request by

reducing the Office of the Under Secretary for Management and Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing.

Since the demise of Osama bin Laden, it has come to light that al Qaeda had ambitious plans to launch an attack against our Nation's mass transit system and their riders, our constituents. Now more than ever we must ensure that our mass transit and surface transportation is secure by developing risk-based policies and programs that devote appropriate resources to securing these systems against a terrorist attack. This amendment would increase the surface transportation security account at TSA by \$5 million, bringing the account in line with the President's request for FY 2012. In Washington terms, \$5 million may not sound like much, but it is a critical increase to the Surface Transportation Security account at TSA, which has historically been underfunded. This account funds frontline homeland security personnel in the form of surface transportation inspectors who, in addition to reviewing regulatory compliance, consult with transit agencies and rail companies in improving security infrastructure and operational protocols.

The American public, whether it's Amtrak or long-distance rail, need our involvement. We cannot afford to diminish the protection of our rail lines that grandmothers and grandchildren, college students and commuters use. This is a smart investment at a critical time. Be reminded, we got no notice about 9/11, and we will get no notice about attacks on our rail system.

To fund this increase, my amendment simply reduces \$2.5 million from two different accounts. This is a wise decision at this time to help our communities and mitigate the terrorist threat to our local transit systems, as well as to improve security for passenger and freight rail. Just be the community that would be impacted by a horrific terrorist act. Whether it is through the neighborhoods of Houston, whether it's in Los Angeles or the Midwest, all of our communities and constituents are serviced by some form of surface transportation or mass transit, and as we have seen abroad, this mode of transportation is vulnerable to terrorist attack. From Spain to London, they know the truth, and we must stand vigilant. Providing this increased funding for our surface transportation inspectors is a wise investment on behalf of the American people, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation, but I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the bill already reduces the Office of Under

Secretary substantially, 6 percent below the request and 26 percent below the FY11 CR, reflecting the fact that the bill includes no funding to continue the construction of the Department of Homeland Security headquarters. The bill has reduced management to a bare minimum, with reduction of 29 percent to leadership and management offices.

The Department of Homeland Security is an agency of 230,000 employees. The number of employees in OSEM is 700, or less than one-third of 1 percent, and funding provided is also one-third of 1 percent for the total DHS budget. This is extremely small for assets needed to manage a major security department. Additional reductions would prevent filling key staffing positions and thus limit the ability of the Department to respond to national emergencies and provide stable leadership to the public and the Nation in the event of a large disaster or terrorist event.

These reductions are not compatible with running a Cabinet agency. No other Federal department is asked to manage such large responsibilities and operating components with such a small and stretched headquarters element. Therefore, I urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I would like to yield to my colleague from Texas so that she can respond to the last speaker.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the ranking member.

I think it's important; I listened to the gentleman, Mr. ADERHOLT, list a lot of numerical and factual points about personnel. Let me be very clear, as Senator LIEBERMAN said, all of our systems need to be on high alert and all of our citizens need to be on high alert as we approach the 10th anniversary of 9/11.

It is clear, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that something is awry with al Qaeda. Al Qaeda is interested in transportation modes, and they're interested in our rail systems. They have already done Mumbai, they have done London, and they have done Madrid; and therefore, they are looking at the United States. No, we don't have specifics, but we do have the potential of our rail lines crossing America being ripe targets for al Qaeda. This is a very small amount that would allow us to have surface inspectors who are truly crucial to the protection of the Nation's mass transit, freight, and long-distance rail.

Every State is impacted, from New Hampshire to Florida, from the Midwest to the West, Texas. Houston has as its city insignia a rail. Why? Because trains crisscross our community. Therefore, I think it behooves us to be bipartisan and to actually support an

amendment that provides a cushion of protection and a cushion and an armor, if you will, against the thoughts and the mindsets of al Qaeda. Yes, they are franchised, they are splintered, but that makes it all the easier for them to find their way here to the United States.

I remind my colleagues that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I ask my colleagues to consider the small investment it would take to be able to secure the Nation's railways. And as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, the authorizing committee, I can assure you that we are seeing these kinds of threats in terms of the vastness of our system, and we need to be able to protect our system.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise before you and my colleagues to take the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1717, "Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes." My amendment would increase the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) Surface Transportation Security's account by \$5 million and restore funding for this account at the President's submitted request, offset by reducing the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing (TTAC).

Since the demise of Osama bin Laden, it has come to light that al-Qaeda had ambitious plans to launch an attack against our Nation's mass transit systems and their riders, our constituents.

Now more than ever, we must ensure that our mass transit and surface transportation is secure by developing risk-based policies and programs that devote appropriate resources to securing these systems against terrorist attack.

This amendment would increase the Surface Transportation Security account at TSA by \$5 million, bringing the account in line with the President's request for FY 2012.

In Washington terms, \$5 million may not sound like much, but it is a critical increase to the Surface Transportation Security account at TSA, which has historically been underfunded.

This account funds front line homeland security personnel in the form of surface transportation inspectors who, in addition to reviewing regulatory compliance, consult with transit agencies and rail companies in improving security infrastructure and operational protocols.

Surface inspectors also help disseminate best practices to transit and rail entities across the Nation.

This is a smart investment at a critical time for surface transportation security.

To fund this increase, my amendment reduces \$2.5 million from the Transportation Threat and Credentialing program and \$2.5 million from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management at the Department of Homeland Security. Both of these programs are well funded—TTAC at \$183 million and the Under Secretary's office at \$234 million.

This is a wise decision at this time to help our communities address and mitigate the terrorist threat to our local transit systems, as well as for improving security for passenger and freight rail.

All of our communities and constituents are serviced by some form of surface transportation or mass transit, and as we have seen abroad, this mode of transportation is vulnerable to terrorist attack.

We must be vigilant in recognizing the threat, make wise investment in security, and collaborate with industry stakeholders to secure this transportation mode that is essential to our economy and way of life.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF  
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$600,000)”.

Page 92, line 7, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$600,000)”.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to H.R. 2017. My amendment simply cuts \$600,000 from the Office of the Under Secretary in the Department of Homeland Security and places those funds in the deficit reduction account.

During this economic emergency, we must find cuts wherever we can, especially when a Department is not being a good steward of the funding that Congress provides it.

If you look at this bill, the Secretary is being allocated nearly \$127 million, of which \$6 million goes to the Office of Legislative Affairs. I think the American people would agree with me that \$6 million is a lot of money for political appointees who refuse to do their job and participate in the oversight process.

On several occasions this year, Mr. Chairman, the Department has either refused to sit on the same panel as other witnesses or has outright refused to appear before various House committees and subcommittees. In fact, as chairman of the House Science Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, I held a hearing on behavioral science and security with the goal of understanding how science informed the development of TSA's SPOT program.

□ 1720

The Department refused my request for a witness from TSA for their own

program, and I'm not the only chairman who has received such shabby and unacceptable treatment. This pattern of arrogance makes fulfilling our oversight responsibilities of the executive branch very difficult, if not impossible.

In the end, it's the American people, Mr. Chairman, who lose if its government cannot perform its most basic constitutional responsibilities. If the Department is not going to meet its obligations of appearing before Congress when requested, it is prudent to apply the funds rescinded in this, my amendment, to more constructive uses such as reducing our deficit.

If 10 percent is good enough for the Lord, I think the Office of Legislative Affairs can part with 10 percent of their funding to aid in our efforts of reducing the burden of debt on our children and grandchildren.

I can think of no higher priority than reducing the deficit and creating jobs in America. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman from Georgia's amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I will not go on at length.

I simply don't think the case has been made for a further reduction. The suspicious passenger, the observation techniques programs that have been cited aren't even under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary being cut. And the bill already cuts \$4,993,000 off of the fiscal year 2011 level for the Office of Under Secretary for Management; and it cuts \$14,118,000 off of the administration's request.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know this is an easy target. Who knows even what under Secretary for Management does. It's a very common technique around here to go after these accounts, these administrative and front office accounts, just for the sake of cutting or maybe to pay for something else that sounds good. But I don't think it's wise. I don't think it's responsible. And I would urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF  
TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the Chairman.

This amendment takes \$10 million from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management of DHS and moves it to the Border, Security, Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology account with the purpose of being used for border cell phone communications to help border residents disseminate border security-related information to Border Patrol and law enforcement for the protection of their lives and our border.

I appreciate the support of Congressman ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania in this bipartisan amendment.

This amendment really is the idea of Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS from Arizona. After having been to the border of Arizona with her staff, I learned firsthand the problems that not only Texas and other States but Arizona specifically has with communication when ranchers are on their property.

On March 27, 2010, rancher Bob Krentz of Arizona was murdered 20 miles north of the border from Mexico in an isolated area of Arizona. The lack of communications capability made Krentz more vulnerable than he would have been otherwise and complicated the search for the assailants. His wife believes it was in a cell phone dead zone where he was killed and that he was trying to call for help, but his cell phone would not work.

Since that time, Congresswoman GIFFORDS has been working diligently on this issue, and I have had the opportunity to work with her on other border security issues as well as this one.

These dead zones are so common that often times border ranchers in Arizona and Texas rely on shortwave radios to communicate and call for help when they are in trouble or they see illegal crossings into their property.

The inability of the U.S. Government to secure the U.S.-Mexico border creates public safety hazards for residents of border areas and the law enforcement agents who patrol them. Many border areas are rural and lack wireless communication capabilities like phone service, and they exacerbate the border-related public safety concern.

Once again, I want to thank Congresswoman GIFFORDS and her staff for this legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and we are joining the Office of Congresswoman GIFFORDS in offering this amendment.

I had the opportunity last week to travel to Congresswoman GIFFORDS' district and the 114-mile border that she has along the Mexican border and her district. And when you see, as my colleague from Texas knows, these ranchers and the territory that they have to cover—and we have a national community campaign now: “If you see something, saying something.” Well, these are areas where you don't have the communications. Even if you see

something, there's no one to tell. There's no way to get that message out.

So what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do with this amendment is trying to make sure that the equipment is there so that these ranchers and community citizens, if they see somebody coming across the border, if they see something that is alarming to them, they're able to communicate it. Right now that technology does not exist. They are literally in the dark as far as communicating it. There is a public safety aspect to this amendment. And there is a Border Patrol aspect—the ability of our law enforcement personnel to communicate with each other and communicate with the local citizens who, in some cases, are out miles and miles away from any form of mobile communications.

So I strongly support this amendment. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership in offering it, and I thank Congresswoman GIFFORDS and her office for leading the charge on this very important technology.

Mr. POE of Texas. This money is necessary so that people who live in border areas can communicate with law enforcement. Cell phone service is a basic necessity for security. It is a national security issue. It is a homeland security issue, and it is a border security issue. I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I reluctantly rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Again, this proposal would further create cuts to the Department's management functions below what is responsible for the Nation's security. The committee has already cut the Department's headquarters and management at historic levels.

As I had mentioned earlier, they include the zoning act, the zeroing out of the funding for the Department's new headquarters. It zeroes out funding for the data center migration. It slashes other activities we cannot afford at this time.

The Department must still have robust funding to manage the many organizations under its authority. The Department was created from nearly two dozen agencies and still faces challenges in achieving the unified homeland security enterprise.

More importantly, the gentleman's amendment proposes that the Department pay for cell towers to provide phone services to the general public.

I'm very sympathetic to the needs of rural communities. I'm from a rural community, and certainly I'm sympathetic to remote ranchers as well. But this is not a cause that the Homeland Security can bear at this time, especially under the constraints that we have. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 19, after the period insert "In addition, for necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, remediate, equip, furnish, and occupy buildings and facilities for the consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security headquarters, \$500,673,000."

Ms. NORTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore \$500,673,000 to the Department of Homeland Security that has been cut entirely from this appropriation. This is the most important construction, private or public, ongoing in our country today, because it involves a secure facility that the Congress has voted to consolidate in order to protect the United States of America in the homeland.

This entire appropriation cuts billions of dollars in order to reduce spending. I wager that there is no cut quite like this one, because this cut guarantees that the taxpayers will be charged more precisely because of this cut. Already, the reduction in funding to the 2011 appropriation for consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security has cost taxpayers \$69 million. Increased costs for this construction of Federal property come from, in this case, lease holdovers, short-term lease extensions, and horrific inefficiencies now imposed because the integration of construction of this mammoth facility will be delayed and interrupted. Any further reduction in funding will substantially increase even more the total costs of this huge project, the largest since the Pentagon. Until now, it was on budget and on time.

Remember why Congress voted to consolidate these 22 agencies in the

first place. Congress has never formed one agency of 22 different agencies. They are spread all over this region. That is why the Bush and the Obama administrations and the Congress have pursued a consistent program to consolidate critical elements of the Department of Homeland Security.

These DHS tenants now reside in the most expensive lease space in the United States, because that's what it is in this region, barring none except perhaps New York City. DHS spends hundreds of millions of dollars on leases throughout the entire region. The rapid consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security now underway will save billions, that's B, billions, in real estate costs, in addition to directing lease revenue to the GSA Federal Buildings Fund, which instead of using appropriated taxpayer dollars, uses agency rental payments to fund the construction and maintenance of Federal real estate giving taxpayers added savings.

Currently, DHS is scheduled for full occupation by 2017. Every day of delay costs the taxpayers thousands of dollars. This is no way to do budget cutting. You don't cut what then costs you more in the short term and in the long term.

Significant progress has already been made. Forty-five percent of the construction is complete, including the Coast Guard National Operations Center and the Coast Guard headquarters. You just don't interrupt a massive, complex building like this unless you want to spend more money than was anticipated.

The timing of this amendment is critical to ensure that the project does not increase costs further. The continued dispersal of vital elements of this critically important agency, necessary for our security, undermines the DHS mission by impeding its operations here and throughout the country. We need quickly to fund this project.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to restore funding for the consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) headquarters construction at St. Elizabeths in the District of Columbia. This amendment would restore \$500,673,000 to the DHS management and operations appropriations account for the project. The amendment would fully fund the President's fiscal year 2012 DHS request for the project, as well as fund the outstanding balance of the President's fiscal year 2011 DHS request.

The reduction in funding in fiscal year 2011 is expected to increase the total project cost by \$69 million because of the loss of integrated construction sequencing and efficiencies between the U.S. Coast Guard building and the adjacent DHS Operations Center construction, in addition to the costs caused by lease holdovers and the short-term lease extensions for the delay for Mission Support consolidation. Any further reduction in funding will substantially increase the total cost of this huge project, which, until the cuts began, was on budget and on time.

The benefits of the consolidation of the DHS headquarters at St. Elizabeths are twofold.

First, Congress voted to consolidate the location of 22 DHS agencies because of the urgent need to improve the management of the agencies in the DHS, which are currently scattered in 40 different locations in the Washington metropolitan region. Consequently, the Bush and Obama Administrations and the Congress have pursued a program to consolidate critical elements of DHS on the federally-owned St. Elizabeths Campus. The DHS components identified for consolidation at the headquarters include the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, the Transportation Security Administration, Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and liaisons for agencies not being relocated there.

Second, the General Services Administration (GSA) will relocate DHS tenants currently in expensive leased space to federally-owned space. DHS annually spends hundreds of millions of dollars for leases throughout the Washington region. The rapid consolidation of DHS, which is now underway, will allow the federal government to save billions of dollars in real estate costs, in addition to directing lease revenue to the GSA Federal Buildings Fund, which, instead of using taxpayer dollars, uses agency rental payments to fund the construction and maintenance of the federal real estate portfolio, an additional saving to taxpayers. The consolidation on St. Elizabeths is expected to include 4.5 million gross square feet of office space, with 3.5 million square feet on the West Campus and 750,000 square feet on the East Campus. Currently, the St. Elizabeths site is scheduled for full occupation in 2017.

The DHS headquarters consolidation is expected to cost a total of \$3.6 billion, with \$2.2 billion coming from GSA and \$1.4 billion from DHS. To date, the project has received \$1.24 billion and there has been significant progress, including the groundbreaking for the first building on the site, a 1.2 million square foot project that includes a central utility plant and two seven-story parking garages, that will house the USCG headquarters. There has also been significant investment in the infrastructure of the campus, including construction of a perimeter fence and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. As of March 31, 2011, the USCG headquarters is 45% complete.

Full funding of the FY 2012 request would ensure complete funding for, and allow occupation and use of, the USCG headquarters. My amendment is critical to ensure that the cost of the project does not increase because of delays. The continued dispersal of vital components of DHS, a critically important department, undermines its mission by seriously impeding its operations here and throughout the country. As ranking member of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over GSA and this project, I have held nearly half a dozen hearings and roundtables on the co-location and consolidation of DHS at St. Elizabeths. I am anxious to move forward with this project and look forward to the completion of the consolidation so that DHS can turn its full attention to its core mission.

Unless somebody wants to speak on my amendment, I am prepared to withdraw it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly address the amendment.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I continue to reserve a point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama continues to reserve his point of order.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend our colleague from the District of Columbia for her persistent advocacy for this headquarters consolidation and construction, and also for the history she has recounted for us today. I think it's time well spent to understand how both the Bush and Obama administrations and the Subcommittee on Homeland Security Appropriations, through both parties' leadership, have until now supported this project.

The bill before us, however, provides no funding for the new DHS headquarters or for the consolidation of leased property in 2012. That's a pennywise and pound-foolish decision. Already based on the delay in finalizing the 2011 bill and the reduced resources provided in that bill for DHS headquarters construction activities, the cost of the headquarters project has grown. It's grown by \$200 million, from a total cost of \$3.4 billion to \$3.6 billion.

The decision to deny an additional \$159.6 million in 2012 to finalize construction of the first phase of the headquarters project and to begin construction of the second phase will result in yet higher costs in the out-years, and will delay by at least 2 years when the Coast Guard can move into its new headquarters facility, which is already under construction.

Similarly, the bill doesn't provide \$55.6 million requested for lease consolidation activities. Last year, this subcommittee held a very informative hearing with DHS and the General Services Administration on this activity. We heard testimony about the significant financial benefits of reducing the number of leases DHS has from 70 buildings across 46 locations in the greater D.C. area to six to eight buildings. Witnesses testified that this massive footprint disrupts the effectiveness and the cohesiveness of departmental operations and adds needless layers of costs and complexities to facilities management. Additionally, the leases will consume an increasingly larger share of the Department's budget through overhead costs in the coming years.

In a time of fiscal constraint, the Department will not have extra dollars to pay for all of these lease increases without shortchanging frontline and mission-essential programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, at a time when real estate prices continue to be low in the greater Washington area and construction and material costs are relatively low as well, this is the time to make this kind of investment. Funding this activity would save taxpayers money for years to come.

With that, I again commend the gentlewoman for her passionate and effective argument on this point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1740

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POE

Mr. POE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this bill has to do with enough housing for people who are illegally in this country in order to be detained and deported back to where they came from.

This past Sunday morning in Houston, Texas, police officer Kevin Will was on patrol. He was working an accident scene, talking to a witness at that accident scene, when a person comes barreling through the police barricade, in spite of the warning lights that were on top of the police cruisers.

When Kevin Will saw that the car was coming towards him, he told this witness to jump out of the way. The witness jumps out of the way, and this individual runs over and kills Officer Kevin Will. He was charged with evading arrest, he was charged with possession of cocaine, and he was charged with intoxication manslaughter of a police officer, and he was in this country illegally. He had previously been deported twice.

The district attorney's office said this individual is a member of the MS-13 gang, and now he is still in the United States committing crimes.

There are not enough places to house these people like this criminal after they serve their time and house them so that they can be deported back where they came from.

What this bill does is allocate more money for detention beds so that we can detain these people while we are awaiting to deport them back where they came from so that we can have a safer community, so that these people aren't running loose somewhere in the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and their very capable staff in putting strong language in the bill and encouraging the Immigration and Customs Enforcement office to fill as many beds as possible. We have given the agency an unprecedented amount of money and leeway and guidance in this bill to fill every available bed, public, private, county, State bed with individuals who cross the border illegally, with individuals who are released from county and State prisons that are supposed to be deported criminally.

The solution to the problem of illegals crossing the border, the guns, the gangs, the drugs, the crime, is not complicated. It is called law enforcement. We want to enforce existing law with the support of the local community. We have very strong support from the communities on the border and, in fact, we are enforcing existing law, which is 6 months in jail if you cross the border illegally, with great success in the Del Rio sector, and it is being rolled out in the Laredo sector.

We are working together with my good friend, my colleague, HENRY CUELLAR, TED POE, and I with the support of the local community, the local prosecutors, the Border Patrol, the prosecutors, with great success.

If I could, I would like to yield briefly to my friend from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) controls the time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank both of my colleagues from Texas. It is a program that does work. We have sat down, we have gone to Laredo. We have seen it work in the Del Rio area. We are now working in Laredo.

In fact, the last time we sat with Chief Harris we talked about how we can make this work. They do need some space, and so I certainly want to work with both of my colleagues to make sure we get more of that space, more of the beds to make sure it works.

All we are doing is enforcing a 1954 law that is on the books already, nothing new except enforcing the law. I support what you are doing.

Mr. POE of Texas. I would urge this amendment be adopted. What it does is provide more space so that we can detain people and deport them back where they came from.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI be-

cause the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the subcommittee, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. MCCAUL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have not seen the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is the gentleman objecting to the unanimous consent request propounded by the gentleman from Texas that the amendment be considered as having been read?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Yes, I am. We have not seen the amendment.

The CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read the amendment.

The Clerk continued to read.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will increase spending by \$50 million for Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine operations. It will include funding for at least 2 UAV systems, as well as much needed helicopters and marine vessels to assist CBP operations along the border.

This amendment will provide the resources to increase the number of flight crews, training, and ground operations needed to support the mounting requests for aerial surveillance missions and boat crews to patrol the rivers and lakes along our border.

CBP air marine support supplements our agents on the ground, allowing CBP to deploy fewer agents in a specific area. CBP air marine currently operates 7 UAVs and intends to grow the fleet to a total of 18 to 24 by 2016.

I have seen the benefits of these missions personally, along with my good friend and colleague from the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. CUELLAR, to whom I yield at this time.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank my good friend from Texas. I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for everything they have done for border security. We really appreciate it.

We just feel that we ought to put a little bit of money to have the OM and, of course, the UAVs. We have gone down to Corpus. We have been there with General Kostelnik, who I think is doing a great job.

What they do is provide ICE, in the sky, flying at 19,000 feet, they can see what is happening, and it provides the intelligence to the State, Federal and local. It is certainly something I support.

I want to thank again my friend, Mr. MCCAUL, for the work that you have done on this particular amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be recognized on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Similar to the last ruling, to be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill as argued by the chairman of the subcommittee, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read. The point of order is sustained.

□ 1750

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 47, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase funding for Operation Stonegarden by \$10 million. And while the underlying bill increases funding from \$50 million to \$55 million, it is not enough.

Operation Stonegarden is a grant program that provides funding to county-level governments along the border to prevent, protect against, and respond to border security issues as well as enhance cooperation and coordination between Federal, State, and local agencies.

At the last House Homeland Security Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response Subcommittee hearing, Sheriff Gonzalez of Zapata County and Sheriff Larry Dever of Arizona explained the need for drastic increases in this funding. While \$55 million is woefully inadequate when spread around, I believe an additional \$10 million would advance the cause.

With that, I yield again to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the work that they have done for border security.

Again, both Mr. MCCAUL and I feel that we ought to add a little bit more help to the local sheriffs and the police that get this assistance.

One of the things that we've seen is, of course, making sure that we don't have that spillover coming in from the Republic of Mexico. And by giving this assistance, whether it's the sheriff down there in Brownsville or going all the way up to El Paso, it's something that's needed, and I certainly support my friend to make sure we increase the funding for Stonegarden by the amount he has asked for.

Again, thank you for your leadership, and again, thank you to the chairman and ranking member for the work they have done on border security.

Mr. MCCAUL. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any Member seek to speak on the point of order?

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this is just a question for my good friend from Alabama.

It's my understanding that these moneys are actually offset by the Under Secretary of Management's office. There is not an increased outlay.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to be heard further?

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member seek to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

For the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous ruling, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the salaries and expenses in order to increase the number of Border Enforcement Security Task Force teams.

I, along with Mr. CUELLAR, have been down to the border and seen the direct benefits of the BEST teams in terms of interdicting the southbound flow of cash and weapons. It's my sincere hope that with additional resources we could stop the flow of weapons going south into Mexico, but also seize the cash and asset forfeiture money that could then, in turn, help pay for our border security operations.

With that, I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Again, I want to thank my colleague from Texas. And again, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for all the work that they have done for border security.

The BEST program is the program that works. Basically what it does is it coordinates State, Federal, local and also our international partners, both Canadians and Mexicans, to work together to make sure that they are able to focus on the same thing, and that is fight transnational crime. It's an idea that worked very well—in fact, it got started in Laredo, Texas. It expanded now to both the northern and southern part of the United States.

And I certainly support my friend to make sure that we work and make sure that the BEST program gets stronger.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under

clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak to the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

For the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous rulings, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase funding by \$10 million for border security fencing, infrastructure and technology. Secretary Napolitano's cancellation of the Secure Border Initiative delays the deployment of technology to secure the border.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's reservation is not timely.

The gentleman from Texas has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The backbone of the new proposed system, integrated fixed towers, will not be in place until January 2013. In place of SBInet, a new border surveillance technology plan has been developed that abandons the fixed sensor tower nature of the original SBInet plan and replaces it with multiple technologies. As a result, the new plan consists of a reduced number of sensor towers envisioned in the SBInet plan, and in their place, lower cost technologies such as mounted radar and camera systems, portable and imaging systems, and thermal imaging devices.

The Secretary said that technology will not be deployed to cover the entire southern border until the year 2025. I believe that is unacceptable. This amendment provides funding for readily available technology that we can deploy quickly to secure the border before that timeframe.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, this will breach our outlays, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to back my chairman in this instance and also urge a rejection of the amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment will increase funding for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office of Detention and Removal. While the underlying bill does increase funding by \$26 million, we need more.

DRO is the primary enforcement arm within ICE for the identification, apprehension and removal of illegal aliens from the United States. DRO is severely underresourced. It is overwhelmed and does not have the resources to do its job. ICE has stated repeatedly that they simply don't have the manpower and resources to deport illegal aliens, even criminal aliens identified through the 287(g) program. The Federal Government has its responsibility, and it needs to step up to the plate.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. For the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous rulings, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment will nearly triple the amount of funding for the popular 287(g) program, which authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security to permit specially trained State and local law enforcement officers to apprehend, investigate or detain aliens during a predetermined time frame and under Federal supervision by ICE.

It is an important force multiplier for ICE in allowing for enhanced capabilities to detain and remove illegal aliens identified by local law enforcement during the course of their duties.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Once again, for the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous rulings, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 14, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$32,000,000)”.

Page 63, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank the chairman and, of course, our ranking member, Mr. PRICE, for all the work that they have done for border security.

This is an amendment similar to Mr. MCCAUL's. It adds \$32 million to the CBP Air/Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement. It takes \$60 million away from the Office of Under Secretary for Manage-

ment, another \$60 million from the Science and Technology Management Administration. Again, this is to purchase at least two additional UAVs and to make sure that they have the operations and maintenance.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we oppose the amendment because we have already added \$30 million above the request. Therefore, we believe this is sufficient funding for this portion of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to underscore what our chairman has said about the generous addition in this bill for this function. These offsets, again, may be easy for Members for whom this looks like just an abstract, front office expenditure; but in fact, they carry real costs. I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), \$50,860,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, \$261,300,000, of which \$105,500,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$155,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That the Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for all information technology acquisition projects that are funded under this heading or are funded by multiple components of the Department of Homeland Security through reimbursable agreements: *Provided further*, That such expenditure plan shall include, for each project funded, the

name of the project, its key milestones, all funding sources, detailed annual and lifecycle costs, and projected cost savings or cost avoidance to be achieved: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for all information technology acquisition projects that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations included for each project and activity tied to mission requirements, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered;

(2) the total estimated cost and projected timeline of completion for all multi-year enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities that are proposed in such budget or underway;

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance and contractor services costs; and

(4) a current acquisition program baseline for each project, that—

(A) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline;

(B) aligns the acquisition programs covered by the baseline to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how each increment will address such known capability gaps; and

(C) defines life-cycle costs for such programs.

#### ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$344,368,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which \$58,757,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$124,000,000, of which not to exceed \$300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An Amendment by Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

An Amendment by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ROYCE of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. POE of Texas.

An Amendment by Mr. CUELLAR of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 333, noes 87, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

#### AYES—333

Ackerman	Cuellar	Hoyer
Adams	Cummings	Hultgren
Akin	Davis (CA)	Hurt
Alexander	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Altmire	Davis (KY)	Israel
Andrews	DeFazio	Jackson (IL)
Austria	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Baca	DeLauro	(TX)
Bachus	Denham	Johnson (GA)
Baldwin	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Barletta	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Barrow	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett	Dicks	Jones
Barton (TX)	Dingell	Kaptur
Bass (CA)	Doggett	Keating
Bass (NH)	Dold	Kelly
Becerra	Donnelly (IN)	Kildee
Berg	Doyle	Kind
Berkley	Duffy	King (NY)
Berman	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Biggett	Edwards	Kissell
Billrakis	Ellison	Kline
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	Kucinich
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Lance
Black	Eshoo	Landry
Blackburn	Farenthold	Langevin
Blumenauer	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Bonner	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Bono Mack	Finler	Latham
Boren	Fincher	LaTourette
Boswell	Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)
Boustany	Fleischmann	Levin
Brady (PA)	Fleming	Lewis (GA)
Braley (IA)	Forbes	Lipinski
Brooks	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Loebuck
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe
Bucshon	Fudge	Lowe
Buerkle	Gallegly	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Garamendi	Lujan
Burton (IN)	Gardner	Lungren, Daniel
Butterfield	Garrett	E.
Camp	Gerlach	Lynch
Canseco	Gibbs	Maloney
Capito	Gibson	Marchant
Capps	Gingrey (GA)	Marino
Capuano	Goodlatte	Markey
Cardoza	Granger	Matheson
Carnahan	Graves (MO)	Matsui
Carney	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McCaul
Cassidy	Griffin (AR)	McClintock
Castor (FL)	Griffith (VA)	McCollum
Chabot	Grijalva	McCotter
Chandler	Grimm	McDermott
Chu	Guinta	McGovern
Cicilline	Guthrie	McHenry
Clarke (MI)	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Clarke (NY)	Hall	McKinley
Clay	Hanabusa	McNerney
Cleaver	Hanna	Meehan
Clyburn	Harper	Meeks
Coble	Harris	Michaud
Coffman (CO)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Hayworth	Miller (NC)
Cole	Heck	Miller, George
Connolly (VA)	Heinrich	Moore
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	Moran
Cooper	Himes	Murphy (CT)
Costa	Hinchey	Murphy (PA)
Costello	Hinojosa	Nadler
Courtney	Hirono	Napolitano
Cravaack	Hochul	Neal
Crawford	Holden	Noem
Critz	Holt	Nugent
Crowley	Honda	Nunes

Olver	Ros-Lehtinen	Speier
Owens	Ross (AR)	Stark
Pallone	Rothman (NJ)	Stearns
Pascarella	Roybal-Allard	Stivers
Pastor (AZ)	Runyan	Sutton
Paul	Ruppersberger	Terry
Paulsen	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Payne	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Pelosi	Sánchez, Linda	Tiberi
Perlmutter	T.	Tipton
Peters	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Peterson	Sarbanes	Towns
Petri	Scalise	Tsongas
Pingree (ME)	Schakowsky	Turner
Platts	Schiff	Upton
Poe (TX)	Schilling	Van Hollen
Polis	Schmidt	Velázquez
Price (GA)	Schock	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Schrader	Walberg
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Walden
Rahall	Scott, David	Waters
Rangel	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Reed	Serrano	Waxman
Rehberg	Sessions	Weiner
Reichert	Sewell	Welch
Renacci	Sherman	West
Reyes	Shimkus	Whitfield
Ribble	Shuler	Wilson (FL)
Richardson	Shuster	Wittman
Richmond	Simpson	Womack
Rigell	Sires	Woodall
Rivera	Slaughter	Woolsey
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Yu
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Yarmuth
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Rooney	Smith (WA)	Young (FL)

#### NOES—87

Aderholt	Huelskamp	Pence
Amash	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Bachmann	Hunter	Pompeo
Benishek	Issa	Posey
Bilbray	Jenkins	Quayle
Bishop (UT)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Brady (TX)	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Kingston	Rokita
Campbell	Labrador	Roskam
Cantor	Lamborn	Ross (FL)
Carter	Lankford	Royce
Conaway	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Schweikert
Culberson	Long	Scott (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Dreier	Mack	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Ellmers	McKeon	Sullivan
Flake	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Flores	Rodgers	Thornberry
Fox	Mica	Walsh (IL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Webster
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wolf
Hartzler	Nunnelee	Yoder
Hastings (WA)	Olson	Young (IN)
Hensarling	Palazzo	
Herger	Pearce	

#### NOT VOTING—12

Chaffetz	Lucas	Walz (MN)
Giffords	Manzullo	Wasserman
Gohmert	Myrick	Schultz
Gonzalez	Schwartz	
Higgins	Tierney	

□ 1838

Messrs. MCCARTHY of California, PEARCE, PENCE, WESTMORELAND, MACK, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SERRANO, SCHOCK, BECERRA, NUNES, SESSIONS, FLEISCHMANN, SCALISE, FARENTHOLD, SHIMKUS, WITTMAN, FORBES, WOODALL, GARRETT, GALLEGLY, KLINE, HULTGREN, RIGELL, BONNER, MARCHANT, CRAWFORD, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, GUTHRIE, WOMACK, KELLY, BURGESS, ROGERS of Michigan, ALEXANDER, FLEMING and COLE, and Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms.

BUERKLE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 266, not voting 12, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 385]

#### AYES—154

Ackerman	Green, Al	Olver
Andrews	Grijalva	Owens
Baca	Grimm	Pallone
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanna	Paul
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Berman	Higgins	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Himes	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinche	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Quigley
Burgess	Holt	Rangel
Butterfield	Honda	Reyes
Capps	Hoyer	Richardson
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Rush
Cassidy	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	King (NY)	Schrader
Cleaver	Lance	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Stark
DeGette	Maloney	Sutton
DeLauro	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Denham	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Dingell	McCaul	Towns
Doggett	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle	McDermott	Van Hollen
Edwards	McGovern	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Visclosky
Engel	Michaud	Waters
Eshoo	Miller, George	Watt
Farr	Moore	Weiner
Fattah	Moran	Welch
Finer	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Woolsey
Fudge	Napolitano	Wu
Garamendi	Neal	Yarmuth

#### NOES—266

Adams	Barletta	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Akin	Bartlett	Bishop (NY)
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Altmire	Bass (NH)	Black
Amash	Benishek	Blackburn
Austria	Berg	Bonner
Bachmann	Biggert	Bono Mack
Bachus	Bilbray	Boren

Boswell	Hayworth	Pitts
Boustany	Heck	Platts
Brady (TX)	Heinrich	Poe (TX)
Brooks	Hensarling	Pompeo
Broun (GA)	Herger	Posey
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)
Bucshon	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Buerkle	Holden	Quayle
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Rahall
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Camp	Hultgren	Rehberg
Campbell	Hunter	Reichert
Canseco	Hurt	Renacci
Capito	Inslee	Ribble
Cardoza	Issa	Rigell
Carter	Jenkins	Rivera
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Roby
Chandler	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Coffman (CO)	Kelly	Rogers (MI)
Cole	Kind	Rohrabacher
Conaway	King (IA)	Rokita
Conyers	Kingston	Rooney
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello	Kissell	Roskam
Cravaack	Kline	Ross (AR)
Crawford	Kucinich	Ross (FL)
Crenshaw	Labrador	Royce
Critz	Lamborn	Runyan
Culberson	Landry	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Lankford	Ryan (OH)
Davis (KY)	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (WI)
DeFazio	Latham	Scalise
Dent	LaTourette	Schilling
DesJarlais	Latta	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Schock
Dicks	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Dold	Loebback	Scott (SC)
Donnelly (IN)	Long	Scott, Austin
Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Luján	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Sherman
Duncan (TN)	E.	Shimkus
Ellmers	Lynch	Shuler
Emerson	Mack	Shuster
Farenthold	Marchant	Simpson
Fincher	Marino	Smith (NE)
Fitzpatrick	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Fleischmann	McCintock	Southerland
Fleming	McCotter	Stearns
Flores	McHenry	Stivers
Forbes	McIntyre	Stutzman
Fortenberry	McKeon	Sullivan
Fox	McKinley	Terry
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Thornberry
Galleghy	McNerney	Tiberi
Gardner	Meehan	Tipton
Garrett	Mica	Turner
Gerlach	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gibson	Miller (NC)	Walden
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Waxman
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Webster
Gowdy	Neugebauer	West
Granger	Noem	Westmoreland
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Green, Gene	Nunnelee	Wittman
Griffin (AR)	Olson	Wolf
Griffith (VA)	Palazzo	Womack
Guinta	Paulsen	Woodall
Guthrie	Pearce	Yoder
Hall	Pence	Young (AK)
Harper	Peters	Young (FL)
Harris	Peterson	Young (IN)
Hartzler	Petri	
Hastings (WA)		

#### NOT VOTING—12

Cantor	Lucas	Walz (MN)
Chaffetz	Manzullo	Wasserman
Giffords	Myrick	Schultz
Gohmert	Schwartz	
Gonzalez	Tierney	

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1844

Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER and KUCINICH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 151, not voting 13, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 386]

#### AYES—268

Adams	DesJarlais	Johnson (IL)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Akin	Dold	Johnson, Sam
Alexander	Donnelly (IN)	Jones
Altmire	Dreier	Jordan
Amash	Duffy	Kelly
Austria	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Bachus	Ellmers	Kingston
Barletta	Emerson	Kinzinger (IL)
Barrow	Farenthold	Kissell
Bartlett	Fincher	Kline
Bass (NH)	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Benishek	Flake	Lamborn
Berg	Fleischmann	Lance
Berkley	Fleming	Landry
Biggert	Flores	Lankford
Bilbray	Forbes	Latham
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Latta
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Bonner	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Bono Mack	Gardner	Loebback
Boren	Garrett	Long
Boswell	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Boustany	Gibbs	Lummis
Brady (TX)	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Brooks	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Mack
Buchanan	Gosar	Marchant
Bucshon	Gowdy	Marino
Buerkle	Granger	Matheson
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McCaul
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McCintock
Campbell	Grimm	McCotter
Canseco	Guinta	McHenry
Cantor	Guthrie	McIntyre
Capito	Hall	McKeon
Carney	Hanna	McKinley
Carson (IN)	Harper	McMorris
Carter	Harris	Rodgers
Chabot	Hartzler	Meehan
Chandler	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Coble	Hayworth	Michaud
Coffman (CO)	Heck	Miller (FL)
Cole	Heinrich	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Connolly (VA)	Herger	Mulvaney
Cooper	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Costello	Higgins	Neugebauer
Cravaack	Hochul	Noem
Crawford	Holden	Nugent
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Nunes
Critz	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Cuellar	Hultgren	Olson
Culberson	Hunter	Palazzo
Davis (KY)	Hurt	Pascarell
DeFazio	Inslee	Paul
Denham	Issa	Paulsen
Dent	Jenkins	Pearce

Pence  
 Peters  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Rahall  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam  
 Ross (AR)  
 Ross (FL)  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Scalise  
 Schilling  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Southernland  
 Stearns

Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Wu  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

# AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 327, noes 93, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

## AYES—327

Ackerman  
 Andrews  
 Baca  
 Baldwin  
 Bass (CA)  
 Becerra  
 Berman  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Cassidy  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chu  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (MI)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Deutch  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)  
 Fudge

Garamendi  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Luján  
 Lynch  
 Maloney  
 Markey  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McMorris  
 Meeks  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal

Olver  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rumpert  
 Rush  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Speier  
 Stark  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Calvert  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Woolsey  
 Yarmuth

Ackerman  
 Adams  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Austria  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bass (NH)  
 Benishek  
 Berg  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blumenauer  
 Bono Mack  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boustany  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brooks  
 Brown (GA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Buerkle  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Campbell  
 Canseco  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Chabot  
 Chandler  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (MI)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Cooper  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cravaack  
 Crawford  
 Critz  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar

Culberson  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (KY)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Dicks  
 Doggett  
 Dold  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 Farenthold  
 Fattah  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Flake  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fleming  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Fudge  
 Gallegly  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hayworth  
 Heck  
 Heinrich  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Higgins  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hochul  
 Holden  
 Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Inslee  
 Issa  
 Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Kaptur  
 Kelly  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kissell  
 Kline  
 Kucinich  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Landry  
 Langevin  
 Lankford  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeback  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Long  
 Lowey  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luján  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mack  
 Maloney  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley

McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNerney  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moore  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Olver  
 Palazzo  
 Pascarella  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Petri  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Quayle  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert

Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Roskam  
 Ross (AR)  
 Ross (FL)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Rumpert  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Scalise  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schilling  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Southernland  
 Speier  
 Stearns  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Tonko  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Webster  
 Weiner  
 Welch  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

## NOES—93

Aderholt  
 Amash  
 Baca  
 Baldwin  
 Bass (CA)  
 Becerra  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bonner  
 Butterfield  
 Cantor  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chu  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clyburn  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Costa  
 Crenshaw  
 Cummings  
 Davis (IL)  
 Denham  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Eshoo

Farr  
 Filner  
 Foxx  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garamendi  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Grijalva  
 Grimm  
 Gutierrez  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Keating  
 Lance  
 Larsen (WA)  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 Meeks  
 Miller, George  
 Moran  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal

Nunnelee  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Peterson  
 Quigley  
 Reed  
 Richardson  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Richmond  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Schrader  
 Smith (NE)  
 Stark  
 Terry  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Towns  
 Waxman  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey

## NOT VOTING—12

Chaffetz  
 Giffords  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Lucas

Manzullo  
 Myrick  
 Schwartz  
 Slaughter  
 Tierney

Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1851

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on

## NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)  
 Chaffetz  
 Giffords  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez

Lucas  
 Manzullo  
 Myrick  
 Schwartz  
 Slaughter

Tierney  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute is remaining in this vote.

□ 1848

Messrs. PALLONE and SCHIFF changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 256, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

#### AYES—162

Ackerman	Gardner	Pearce
Adams	Gibson	Pelosi
Andrews	Granger	Perlmutter
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Peters
Barletta	Green, Gene	Petri
Barrow	Hall	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hanna	Platts
Bass (NH)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Benishkek	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Berg	Herger	Quayle
Berkley	Herrera Beutler	Rahall
Bilbray	Higgins	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Hinojosa	Reichert
Blackburn	Hochul	Renacci
Bono Mack	Holden	Reyes
Boren	Huelskamp	Richardson
Boswell	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Insee	Rogers (MI)
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Issa	Ross (AR)
Braley (IA)	Kaptur	Ross (FL)
Brooks	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Broun (GA)	Kelly	Royce
Burgess	Kind	Ruppersberger
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Camp	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Campbell	Latham	Schiff
Canseco	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Castor (FL)	Loeback	Schrader
Chabot	Lynch	Schweikert
Chandler	Mack	Scott, Austin
Clarke (MI)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Marino	Sessions
Coffman (CO)	Matheson	Sherman
Conaway	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Critz	McCaul	Shuler
Cuellar	McClintock	Sires
Culberson	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Cummings	McKeon	Southerland
DeFazio	McMorris	Stearns
Deutch	Rodgers	Sullivan
Doggett	Michaud	Sutton
Donnelly (IN)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Doyle	Miller (MI)	Towns
Duffy	Miller, Gary	Upton
Duncan (SC)	Moore	Webster
Engel	Murphy (PA)	Weiner
Farenthold	Neugebauer	West
Fattah	Nugent	Young (AK)
Fitzpatrick	Nunes	Young (FL)
Flake	Olson	Young (IN)
Fudge	Pallone	
Garamendi	Pascrell	

#### NOES—256

Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Carney
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)
Alexander	Black	Carter
Altmire	Blumenauer	Cassidy
Amash	Bonner	Cicilline
Austria	Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)
Baca	Buchanan	Clay
Bachus	Bucshon	Cleaver
Baldwin	Buerkle	Clyburn
Bartlett	Cantor	Cohen
Bass (CA)	Capito	Cole
Becerra	Capps	Connolly (VA)
Berman	Capuano	Conyers
Biggert	Cardoza	Cooper
Bilirakis	Carnahan	Costa

Costello	Jackson Lee	Pompeo
Courtney	(TX)	Posey
Cravaack	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Rangel
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ribble
Davis (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Richmond
Davis (KY)	Jones	Rigell
DeGette	Jordan	Rivera
DeLauro	Kildee	Roby
Denham	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Dent	Kinzing (IL)	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Kissell	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rooney
Dicks	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	Labrador	Roskam
Dold	Lamborn	Roybal-Allard
Dreier	Lance	Runyan
Duncan (TN)	Landry	Rush
Edwards	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Ellison	Lankford	T.
Ellmers	LaTourette	Scalise
Emerson	Latta	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Schilling
Farr	Levin	Schock
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Scott (SC)
Fincher	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Scott, David
Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Flores	Long	Sewell
Forbes	Lowe	Shuster
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Fox	Lujan	Smith (NE)
Frank (MA)	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (WA)
Frelinghuysen	E.	Speier
Gallegly	Maloney	Stark
Garrett	Markey	Stivers
Gerlach	Matsui	Stutzman
Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Gingrey (GA)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Goodlatte	McCotter	Thompson (MS)
Gosar	McDermott	Thompson (PA)
Govdy	McGovern	Tiberi
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Tipton
Green, Al	McKinley	Tonko
Griffin (AR)	McNerney	Tsongas
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Turner
Grijalva	Meeks	Van Hollen
Grimm	Mica	Velázquez
Guinta	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Guthrie	Miller, George	Walberg
Gutierrez	Moran	Walden
Hanabusa	Mulvaney	Walsh (IL)
Harper	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Waxman
Hastings (CA)	Napolitano	Welch
Hayworth	Neal	Westmoreland
Heck	Noem	Whitfield
Heinrich	Nunnelee	Wilson (FL)
Hensarling	Oliver	Wilson (SC)
Himes	Owens	Wittman
Hinche	Palazzo	Wolf
Hirono	Pastor (AZ)	Womack
Holt	Paul	Woodall
Honda	Paulsen	Woolsey
Hoyer	Payne	Wu
Huizenga (MI)	Pence	Yarmuth
Hultgren	Peterson	Yoder
Hurt	Pingree (ME)	
Jackson (IL)	Polis	

#### NOT VOTING—14

Chaffetz	Lucas	Tierney
Chu	Manzullo	Walz (MN)
Giffords	Myrick	Wasserman
Gohmert	Schwartz	Schultz
Gonzalez	Slaughter	Waters

#### □ 1855

Mr. NEAL and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan and BROOKS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2055, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-97) on the resolution (H. Res. 288) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2017.

#### □ 1858

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 6, line 22.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I want to thank Chairman ADERHOLT, my good friend from Alabama, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for bringing this important legislation to the floor and for your hard work during these difficult budget times. As chairman of the subcommittee with sole authorizing jurisdiction over the Transportation Security Administration in the House, I welcome our continued

collaboration on transportation security issues.

Specifically today, I want to discuss with you the need to increase the number of explosive detection canines within TSA for aviation and surface transportation security. Within the area of passenger screening, we all know that explosive detection canines are one of the most effective screening means, and they do it without many of the concerns and costs of other types of detection technology.

□ 1900

They do not impede the flow of traffic, and they avoid privacy concerns because they do not come into direct contact with passengers.

We know that the military canine units in Iraq and Afghanistan can detect improvised explosive devices with an 80 percent rate, much higher than the 50 percent expected from those units with other technologies.

And for all the good that canines do, they do it at a better price than other technologies. If there is a better, more cost-efficient option to increasing canines, I am open to any suggestion.

In fact, according to published reports, the elite Navy SEAL team that killed Osama bin Laden likely carried at least one canine with them on that mission into Pakistan. Surely, then, canines can and do provide invaluable bomb detection services here at home.

Especially in these times of heightened terrorist threats, along with the information that we gathered from killing bin Laden, we need to prudently increase the number of detection canines in TSA.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Chairman ROGERS, I too look forward to continuing to work with you on this issue involving the TSA. I completely agree that the explosive detection canines are a cost-effective, proven critical part of the TSA security. As we continue to work together on both appropriations and your efforts on reauthorizing and transforming TSA, I look forward to exploring all of the potential options to utilize detection canines to patrol our transportation systems.

Thank you for your work in making our transportation systems more secure.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Thank you, Chairman ADERHOLT. I also want to thank my colleague, Representative JASON CHAFFETZ, for his work on this issue and my friend and colleague, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for her dedication to it as well.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE II

#### SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

#### U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and

animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 8,000 (7,000 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; \$8,769,518,000, of which \$3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (46 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not less than \$287,901,000 shall be for Air and Marine Operations; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; and of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2012, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be \$35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be available to compensate any employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for Inspection and Detection Technology that identifies for each technology—

(1) the inventory of Inspection and Detection Technology by location and date of deployment;

(2) the proposed appropriations included in the budget subdivided by the proposed appropriations for procurement, including quantity, deployment, and operations and maintenance;

(3) projected funding levels for procurement in quantity, deployment, and operations and maintenance for each of the next three fiscal years; and

(4) a current acquisition program baseline that—

(A) aligns the acquisition of each technology to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy technology assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each technology will address such known capability gaps;

(B) defines life-cycle costs for each technology, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the technology; and

(C) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for existing legacy technology assets that each technology is intended to replace or recapitalize.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment goes in and strikes out a million dollars and inserts that million dollars back in again and directs that, in our dialogue here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the purpose of taking out the lookout points, the spotter locations that have been formed by the drug smugglers on the U.S. side of the border between primarily Arizona and Mexico.

A number of times I have been down to the border to review these lookout posts, these spotter locations, and on certain occasions I have climbed to the top of those small mountains where they overlook the transportation links that we have the intersections, and the drug smugglers have actually taken paramilitary positions on top of these mountains overlooking U.S. transportation for the purposes of being able to warn their drug and people smugglers when the Border Patrol and other law enforcement are coming along the way. I have gone to the top of these mountains with Border Patrol and with the Shadow Wolves down there on the border and flown to the top of some of these mountains to take the positions that are taken by the spotters.

This is something that this Congress has spoken to before. This amendment has passed in the past, and what it does is it directs the Border Patrol and their security personnel to take those locations out, not to concede these tactical locations inside the United States that go as far up as Tucson and on north towards Phoenix.

And, in fact, about 4 years ago, I and a couple of others put together a map of these locations. I stood with some of our law enforcement personnel, and I said, Show me where on the map. They started drawing X's on the map. I took it along the Arizona border, and when we were done, I had over 75 locations of mountaintops that were manned by drug smuggling personnel. They are supplied and resupplied, Mr. Chairman.

This Congress can't tolerate those kinds of locations here in the United States, and I urge the adoption of my amendment, which simply directs the law enforcement personnel to use that million dollars to take out the spotters on the lookouts on the mountains that control the transportation and let smuggling happen within the United States.

I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition?

Mr. ADERHOLT. I have no objection and accept the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection automated systems, \$334,275,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which not less than \$140,000,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for the Automated Commercial Environment program including results to date, plans for the program, and a list of projects with associated funding from prior appropriations and provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for the funds made available under this heading that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations included for each project and activity tied to mission requirements, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered;

(2) the total estimated cost and projected timeline of completion for all multi-year enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget or underway;

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance and contractor services costs; and

(4) current acquisition program baselines for the Automated Commercial Environment and TECS Modernization respectively, that—

(A) note and explain any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline;

(B) align these acquisition programs to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how each increment will address such known capability gaps; and

(C) define life-cycle costs for these programs.

#### BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, \$500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$150,000,000 shall not be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive a detailed expenditure plan prepared by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and submitted not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, for a program to establish and maintain a security barrier along the borders of the United States, of fencing and vehicle barriers where practicable, and of other forms of fencing, tactical infrastructure, and technology: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a

multi-year investment and management plan for the Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology account, that includes for each tactical infrastructure and technology deployment—

(1) the funding level in that budget and projected funding levels for each of the next three fiscal years, including a description of the purpose of such funding levels;

(2) the deployment plan, by border segment, that aligns each deployment to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements related to achieving operational control, and explaining how each tactical infrastructure or technology deployment will address such known capability gaps; and

(3) a current acquisition program baseline that—

(A) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the most recent acquisition program baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Review Board;

(B) includes a phase-out and life-cycle recapitalization schedule delineated by fiscal year for existing and new tactical infrastructure and technology deployments that each deployment is intended to replace or recapitalize; and

(C) includes qualitative performance metrics that assess the effectiveness of new and existing tactical infrastructure and technology deployments and inform the next multi-year investment and management plan related to achieving operational control of the Northern and Southwest borders of the United States.

#### AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operational training and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts, \$499,966,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been identified as excess to U.S. Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2012 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the update to the five-year strategic plan for the air and marine program directed in conference report 109-241 accompanying Public Law 109-90 that addresses missions, structure, operations, equipment, facilities, and resources including deployment and command and control requirements, and includes a recapitalization plan with milestones and funding, and a detailed staffing plan with associated costs to achieve full staffing to meet all mission requirements.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, oversee, administer, and maintain buildings and facilities and to provide facilities solutions and related infrastructure along with program management support necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, \$234,096,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit an expenditure plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act for the projects funded under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an inventory of the real property of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection and a plan for each activity and project proposed for funding under this heading that includes the full cost by fiscal year of each activity and project proposed and underway in fiscal year 2013.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Michigan seek unanimous consent to have his amendment considered out of order at this point?

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection?

Mr. ADERHOLT. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; \$5,522,474,000, of which not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed \$15,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than \$305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than \$5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); and of which not to exceed \$11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*,

That of the total amount provided, \$15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, not less than \$1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable and aliens who may pose a serious risk to public safety or national security who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable, of which \$194,064,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 45 days after the end of each quarter of the fiscal year, on progress in implementing the preceding proviso and the funds obligated during that quarter to make such progress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: *Provided further*, That the funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2012: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, not less than \$2,750,843,000 is for detention and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$10,300,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013, for the Visa Security Program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been violated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than "adequate" or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: *Provided further*, That nothing under this heading shall prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment on page 12.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa should be advised that the reading has progressed beyond that point in the bill.

Does the gentleman have an amendment to this portion of the bill?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take up the amendment on page 12.

Mr. DICKS. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair hears objection.

Does the gentleman have an amendment to this portion of the bill?

Mr. KING of Iowa. No, sir.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an amendment that strikes \$1 million and puts a million back in. It's an amendment that has been before this Congress before. It's one that supports the Shadow Wolves, and the Shadow Wolves are a part of CBP. They are stationed at Sells, Arizona. They are within, mostly the Tohono O'odham reservation.

They are Native Americans that defend our border and interact culturally and regionally in that area. They have been very, very effective. Their numbers have gone up, approaching 20, but their numbers have diminished now down to only five Shadow Wolves left. They have been excellent about tracking smugglers through the desert.

They have been very effective in law enforcement, and they have been shifted back and forth out of Border Patrol into Customs and Border Protection in the past, but still their numbers are reduced, and this is \$1 million that directs them to go forward and expand the Shadow Wolves again, to sustain them.

I think it's a compliment to the Native Americans all across this country, the effectiveness the Shadow Wolves have provided on the border. Again, I have been down to visit them a number of times, watched them in action, participated with them in action.

□ 1910

Actually with Shadow Wolves, we did a one-strut landing of a Blackhawk on top of those lookout points that were my previous amendment.

And so I urge this Congress to take action today to preserve what's left of the Shadow Wolves, the five that are there, and encourage and direct that there be the employees added to those works. If we let that funding reduce any further, the Shadow Wolves are gone probably forever, and their effectiveness has been something that's been a challenge to the rest of law enforcement along the border.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and accept the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARROW

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Chairman, I recently returned from a trip to our southern border at the invitation of our colleague, GABRIELLE GIFFORDS. While I think it's fair to say that advances have been made since my most recent trip to the border in 2007, I feel it's also necessary to report that significant challenges remain.

Successful border security requires a multi-pronged strategy. We need the physical presence of boots on the ground. We need to enforce the laws on the books to deny benefits to those who are here illegally, and we need to identify illegal immigrants who may pose a serious risk to public safety or national security and deport them.

One of our main tools in identifying those public safety risks is the Law Enforcement Support Center, or the LESC. The LESC serves as a clearinghouse for local law enforcement officials, providing real-time information and help on immigration status of illegal immigrants suspected, arrested, or convicted of criminal activity.

In fiscal year 2010, the LESC fielded over 1 million requests for information from local law enforcement, and recent changes to State law will surely increase those requests. My amendment expresses the intent of Congress to prioritize LESC funding, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I have no objection and accept the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, \$23,860,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for funds made available under this heading that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations included for each project and activity tied to mission requirements and outcomes, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered;

(2) the total estimated cost and projected timeline of completion for all multi-year enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget or underway;

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance and contractor services costs; and

(4) current acquisition program baselines for Atlas and TECS Modernization respectively, that—

(A) note and explain any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline;

(B) align these acquisition programs to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how each increment will address such known capability gaps; and

(C) define life-cycle costs for these programs.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$5,224,556,000, of which \$1,692,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2013, and of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed \$4,155,813,000 shall be for screening operations, of which \$555,003,000 shall be for explosives detection systems; of which \$181,285,000 shall be for checkpoint support; and not to exceed \$1,068,743,000 shall be for aviation security direction and enforcement: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available in the preceding proviso for explosives detection systems, \$222,738,000 shall be available for the purchase and installation of such systems, of which not less than 10 percent shall be available for the purchase and installation of certified explosives detection systems at medium- and small-sized airports: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2012 any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 46,000 full-time equivalent screeners: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security efforts and resources being devoted to develop more advanced integrated passenger screening technologies for the most effective security of passengers and baggage at the lowest possible operating and acquisition costs;

(2) how the Transportation Security Administration is deploying its existing passenger and baggage screener workforce in the most cost effective manner; and

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities:

*Provided further*, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on

other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: *Provided further*, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: *Provided further*, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received in fiscal year 2012, so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation under this heading from the general fund of not more than \$3,194,556,000: *Provided further*, That any security service fees collected in excess of the amount made available under this heading shall be available for fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

#### SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, \$129,748,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

#### TRANSPORTATION THREAT ASSESSMENT AND CREDENTIALING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of screening programs of the Office of Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing, \$183,954,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing transportation security support and intelligence pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$1,032,790,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailed expenditure plans for air cargo security, checkpoint support, and explosives detection systems procurement, refurbishment, and installation on an airport-by-airport basis for fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That these plans shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Air Marshals, \$961,375,000.

#### COAST GUARD

##### OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for, purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than \$700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of \$28,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding \$1,000,000 in total cost at any loca-

tion; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; \$7,071,061,000, of which \$598,278,000 shall be for defense-related activities, of which \$258,278,000 is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress); of which \$24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed \$20,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Coast Guard shall comply with the requirements of section 527 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (10 U.S.C. 4331 note) with respect to the Coast Guard Academy: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$75,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until (1) a revised future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2012 through 2016, as specified under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" of this Act, that is reviewed by the Comptroller General of the United States; (2) the fiscal year 2012 second quarter acquisition report; and (3) the polar operations high latitude study are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress) may be allocated by program, project, and activity, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, \$10,198,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That an expenditure plan that itemizes the costs associated with each project identified in the Coast Guard's Environmental Compliance and Restoration backlog report dated April 11, 2011, shall be included at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

#### RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; \$131,778,000.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, \$1,151,673,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); of which \$427,691,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; of which

\$328,900,000 shall be available until September 30, 2014, to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; of which \$171,140,000 shall be available until September 30, 2014, for other equipment; of which \$116,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for shore, infrastructure, military housing, and aids to navigation facilities, including waterfront facilities at Navy installations used by the Coast Guard, of which \$14,000,000 may be derived from the Coast Guard Housing Fund, established under section 687 of title 14, United States Code; and of which \$107,942,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next five fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

*Provided further*, That the Secretary shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget as submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appropriations shall be identified and justified: *Provided further*, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110-28 shall apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$12,779,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which \$500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): *Provided*, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation: *Provided further*, That a detailed expenditure plan for the amount requested under this heading shall be included with the President's annual budget submission.

#### RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, \$1,440,157,000, to remain available until expended.

#### UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards; travel of United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House

of Representatives; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; \$1,666,451,000, of which not to exceed \$25,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; of which \$2,366,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; and of which \$6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That up to \$18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That up to \$12,307,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That the Director of the United States Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$43,843,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, is for information integration and transformation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in the preceding proviso shall be obligated to purchase or install information technology equipment until the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security submits a report to the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and the House of Representatives certifying that all plans for such integration and transformation are consistent with Department of Homeland Security enterprise architecture requirements: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of facilities, \$6,780,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

TITLE III  
PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS,  
RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY  
NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS  
DIRECTORATE  
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, information technology, and the Office of Risk Management and Analysis, \$42,511,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND  
INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$891,243,000: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$219,420,500 may not be obligated for the National Cyber Security Division program and \$148,639,500 may not be obligated for the Office of Infrastructure Protection until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive and approve a plan for expenditure for each of these programs that describes the strategic context of the programs, the specific goals and milestones set for the programs, and the funds allocated to achieving each of those goals and milestones: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, (1) an expenditure plan for the Office of Infrastructure Protection and the National Cyber Security Division that describes the strategic context of the programs, the specific goals and milestones set for the programs, and the funds allocated to achieving each of those goals and milestones for the fiscal year being appropriated; and (2) a multi-year investment and management plan for the National Cybersecurity Protection System that identifies—

- (1) the inventory of nests and sensors by location and date of deployment;
- (2) the proposed appropriations included in that budget for each increment sub-divided by procurement, including quantity, deployment, and operations and maintenance;
- (3) projected funding levels for procurements including quantity, deployment, and operations and maintenance for each increment for each of the next five fiscal years; and
- (4) a current acquisition program baseline that—

(A) aligns the acquisition to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each technology will address such known capability gaps; and

(B) defines life-cycle costs for each technology, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the technology.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of Federally-owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service: *Provided*, That the Director of the Federal Protective Service shall include with the submission of

the fiscal year 2013 budget a strategic human capital plan that aligns fee collection to personnel requirements based on the current threat assessment; *Provided further*, That an expenditure plan for program, project, and activity and by objective for fiscal year 2012 shall be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That an expenditure plan for program, project, and activity and by objective for fiscal year 2013 shall be submitted at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES VISITOR AND IMMIGRANT  
STATUS INDICATOR TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology program, as authorized by section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1365a), \$297,402,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$194,295,000 is to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$50,000,000 may not be obligated for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology program until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive a plan for expenditure, prepared by the Secretary of Homeland Security, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that meets the statutory conditions specified under this heading in Public Law 110-329: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology program that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations for each activity tied to mission requirements and outcomes, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered, noting any deviations in cost or performance from the prior fiscal year expenditure or investment and management plan;

(2) the total estimated cost, projected funding by fiscal year, and projected timeline of completion for all enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget and underway, including and clearly delineating associated efforts and funds requested by other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security and in the Federal Government, and detailing any deviations in cost, performance, schedule, or estimated date of completion provided in the prior fiscal year expenditure or investment and management plan; and

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance, contractor services, and program costs associated with the management of identity services.

OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, \$165,949,000; of which \$30,171,000 is for salaries and expenses and \$115,164,000 is for BioWatch operations: *Provided*, That \$45,615,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013, for biosurveillance, BioWatch Generation 3, chemical defense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall

be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That an expenditure plan for program, project, and activity and by objective for fiscal year 2012 shall be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That an expenditure plan for program, project, and activity and by objective for each fiscal year shall be submitted at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY  
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for management and administration of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, \$707,298,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), and the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-295): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit an expenditure plan detailed by office for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed \$5,863,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013, for capital improvements at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$35,250,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which not to exceed \$1,600,000 may be made available for administrative costs; and \$5,493,000 shall be for the Office of National Capital Region Coordination: *Provided further*, That for purposes of planning, coordination, execution, and decision-making related to mass evacuation during a disaster, the Governors of the State of West Virginia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or their designees, shall be incorporated into efforts to integrate the activities of Federal, State, and local governments in the National Capital Region, as defined in section 882 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296).

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, \$1,000,000,000, which shall be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security based on the following authorities:

(1) The State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605).

(2) The Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604), notwithstanding subsection (c)(1) of such section, funds provided under this paragraph may be used for grants to organizations (as described under

section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(3) The Metropolitan Medical Response System under section 635 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 723).

(4) The Citizen Corps Program, notwithstanding the requirements of subtitle A of title XX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 603 et seq.).

(5) The Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, under sections 1406 and 1513 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135 and 1163): *Provided*, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(6) Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under section 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1182).

(7) Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(8) The Driver's License Security Grants Program in accordance with section 204 of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note).

(9) The Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 579).

*Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$55,000,000 shall be for Operation Stonegarden and \$192,663,000 shall be for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which \$107,000,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers: *Provided further*, That funds provided under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604) shall only be provided to the top 10 highest risk urban areas: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605), for fiscal year 2012, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under the State Homeland Security Grant Program in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004: *Provided further*, That 10 percent of the amounts provided under this heading shall be transferred to "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Management and Administration" for program administration, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide an expenditure plan for program administration to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide a detailed expenditure plan for program administration for each fiscal year to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)), or any other provision of law, a grantee may use not more than five percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) through (4), the applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 25 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 90 days after the grant announcement, and that the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Man-

agement Agency shall act within 90 days after receipt of an application: *Provided further*, That for grants awarded under paragraphs (5) through (9), the applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications within 45 days after the grant announcement, and that the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act not later than 60 days after receipt of an application: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communications towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: *Provided further*, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That (a) the Center for Domestic Preparedness may provide training to emergency response providers from the Federal Government, foreign governments, or private entities, if the Center is reimbursed for the cost of such training, and any reimbursement under this subsection shall be credited to the account from which the expenditure being reimbursed was made and shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes for which amounts in the account may be expended, and (b) the head of the Center for Domestic Preparedness shall ensure that any training provided under (a) does not interfere with the primary mission of the Center to train State and local emergency response providers: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan to expend by the end of fiscal year 2012 all unexpended balances of funds appropriated for fiscal years before fiscal year 2008 under this heading.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 10, after "heading" insert the following: "at least \$10,000,000 shall be for Buffer Zone Protection Plan Grants, \$50,000,000 shall be for Port Security Grants, \$100,000,000 shall be for public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, \$50,000,000 shall be for interoperable emergency communications, \$42,337,000 shall be for the Metropolitan Medical Response System."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, as former chair and current ranking member on the Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness Subcommittee and member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I offer this amendment in good faith to save lives and to protect American citizens.

Like my Republican colleague, Chairman KING, I have a strong concern with the current appropriations bill in its current form which in and of itself could potentially cause dangerous threats to our national security

by drastically cutting vital response and prevention programs, leaving Americans and their visitors vulnerable when we are most in time of need.

My amendment will make great strides to remedy this danger by ensuring that the Department of Homeland Security allocates \$50 million for the Port Security program, \$100 million for the Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance program, \$50 million for Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant program, \$10 million for the Buffer Zone Protection program, and \$42.3 million for the Metropolitan Medical Response System.

The Richardson amendment dedicates \$252 million of the \$1 billion authorized, all while still preserving the chairman's original intent by allowing 50 percent of those dollars to remain flexible under the direction of what the committee had originally provided and also still maintaining the \$247 million that the committee designated for Stonegarden and for training.

□ 1920

Mr. Chairman, each and every day, America faces threats to our national security. Certainly, the most well-known are the threats to our ports and our transit systems, which I have particularly been focused on given the fact that my district covers two of the largest ports in the entire United States.

However, these programs that I've mentioned so far go beyond the LA area. When you consider the recent tornadoes in Alabama and Missouri, the floods in Tennessee, other natural disasters, and other large-scale emergency situations facing our Nation, strong and effective security and response programs are vital to the lives of all Americans coast to coast. It therefore seems counterintuitive and shortsighted to undermine port and rail security, medical response and communication efforts by cutting the grant programs, or should I say, by not ensuring that these particular categories have sufficient funds in them. My amendment ensures that the funds will be available for port and rail security assistance grant programs.

Now, despite the recent strides that we have made in the war on terror, when we found bin Laden's diary, we learned that he was already in the process of having discussions about attacking our transportation infrastructure system.

At the heart of American infrastructure and fundamental to the success of our economy is clearly protecting our ports and our rail system. These systems have been known to be targeted in the past. All we have to think of is Madrid, London and Tokyo. Across the country, port and transit security forces are already stretched to the limit, and thanks to the substantial cuts that were already made via the end-of-the-year appropriations bill for fiscal year 2011, their jobs were made even more difficult as they were expected to do more with less. The same

is true for other important State and local grant programs, like the Metropolitan Medical Response System, which aids emergency medical first responders and interoperable communications grants that are so important to our first responders.

Finally, I also want to talk about the buffer zone grants that are available, which are important for people to understand. When you think “buffer,” you think maybe a sea area. Actually, they are regional assessments that are done to determine if critical infrastructure is properly protected. If it is not, those grants go out of that particular area to fix it.

Thus, while prioritizing and dedicating 25 percent of the funds to fund port and rail transit grants, medical response programs and emergency communication efforts, my amendment preserves the Secretary’s flexibility to allocate funding as the committee had initially directed.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to please withdraw their points of order, and I ask the Chair to find my amendments in order where they are not cutting other programs or adding to the deficit. I ask my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment and provide these key elements of national security the funding that they need.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentlelady’s argument, and I am sympathetic; but I must insist upon my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CARTER. I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

“An appropriation . . . may not be in order as an amendment . . . for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.”

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for an earmark that is not authorized. The amendment therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment proposes to earmark certain funds in the bill. Under clause 2(a) of rule XXI, such an earmarking must be specifically authorized by law. The burden of establishing authorization in law rests with the proponent of the amendment. Finding that this burden has not been carried, the point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 10, after “Stonegarden” insert “, \$50,000,000 shall be for Interoperable Emergency Operations Grants.”

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the Chair for allowing me to explain my amendment to H.R. 2017. The Richardson amendment directs \$50 million in funding for the Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program.

While the amendment is simple, it is important to keep in mind that being able to connect is a matter of life and death. In this information age, it seems inconceivable that this bill is suggesting that we would not invest in the technology to allow our first responders to communicate with one another.

How many lives would have been saved on 9/11 had New York firefighters and police officers been able to communicate? In Joplin, Missouri, and in Alabama, every day that passes without interoperable communications we put American lives at risk—those who are serving and those who are being served. Now is the time for this investment. We simply can’t afford to delay.

My amendment will help ensure that public safety officials across the United States would have the resources needed to communicate with one another across jurisdictions and across disciplines, hence, being able to prevent the unnecessary loss of life and property in the event of a disaster whether it’s natural or manmade. My amendment recognizes the immense importance of the Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program and the work that is still required to establish a nationwide infrastructure for reliable emergency communications.

Mr. Chairman, when I talk about interoperable equipment, I am looking to preserve that when we have a first responder who picks up a radio that he or she will be able to get in touch with the appropriate people to gain critical information when it matters the most. Throughout the United States, public safety agencies—law enforcement, firefighters, emergency technicians, public health officials, and others—often cannot communicate effectively with one another even within the same jurisdiction or with other public safety agencies at the Federal, State and local levels when responding to emergencies.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I have worked tirelessly to ensure that our communities’ first responders are equipped with the best possible equipment. Interoperable communications allow our Nation’s first responders to communicate in realtime during an emergency. It has been well-documented, including in the 9/11 Commission Report, that the lack of sufficient handheld communications devices may have contributed to the deaths of 343

firefighters in New York City on September 11, 2001, when police could not communicate effectively with firefighters prior to the collapse of the Twin Towers. Similarly, the lack of adequate equipment exacerbated the difficulties in evacuating people during Hurricane Katrina, where many could have been saved if effective communications equipment were available not only to public safety workers but to transit authorities and others who were involved in that evacuation. More recent national catastrophes, including the floods, tornadoes, tsunamis, and beyond, clearly continue to make that argument.

I ask of the chairman to find our amendment in order, and I urge my colleagues to join me in putting public safety first over politics and to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CARTER. I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

“An appropriation . . . may not be in order as an amendment . . . for an expenditure not previously authorized by law . . .”

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for a program that is not authorized by law. The amendment therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair finds that the proponent of the amendment has not carried the burden of establishing that the appropriation in the amendment is specifically authorized by law.

The point of order is sustained.

□ 1930

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 18, after “\$1,000,000,000,” insert “and in addition \$2,000,000,000 which is hereby transferred from unobligated amounts provided under the heading ‘Afghanistan Security Forces Fund’ under title IX of Public Law 112-10.”

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, this amendment provides \$3 billion to the State and local Homeland Security grant program. The effect of this amendment would be to fully restore the funding of this program to fiscal year 2010 levels. We have got to do this. American families are at risk right now. They are at risk of having their homes and their businesses demolished, of being injured or even killed, either by a natural disaster as occurred in the past few weeks as a tornado swept across this country, or by a terrorist attack, which is more likely to come from within our borders.

So we need this funding to hire new firefighters, police officers, emergency medical providers and to properly equip them, and to provide the radio and communication systems that allow our first responders to communicate with their counterparts in other jurisdictions.

The problem is this: our local governments and our State governments don't have the money to fund homeland security investments. It is in part because this Congress chose not to effectively address the foreclosure crisis. The property values upon which our locals are depending to fund first responders have fallen so dramatically, they really don't have the resources to do this. It's up to us. This Congress, it is our duty to secure the safety of the American people.

My amendment will do so by taking a portion of the money, the billions of dollars we spend overseas in Afghanistan to provide that country's security. I say let's take a portion of that and redirect it back home to protect Americans right here in our country because it is American tax dollars in the first place.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate your support, and I urge this Committee to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman continues to reserve his point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in total, this bill provides \$1.7 billion for Homeland Security first responder grants. Of that, the bill provides \$1 billion for the Secretary to provide a program that addresses the highest need and risk. However, as we are all aware, not all programs are funded at the previous year's level.

Several issues drove these reductions. First, as of today, almost a decade after the establishment of DHS, there is no method of measuring what our Nation is receiving for the \$38 billion investment in DHS grants. There are no metrics that indicate how much safer we are today or how much safer we will be if we provide additional funds. This lack of quantitative meas-

urement is intolerable, particularly in today's tight economic times.

Second, grant recipients are not spending the funds that have been provided. Of the \$38 billion provided for the first responder grants, \$13 billion remained unspent. In these trying times, we cannot afford to leave funds sitting on the table when other programs need additional resources and the debt skyrockets.

These cuts will not be easy, but they are long overdue and necessary to address the out-of-control Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. I must insist upon my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

This amendment constitutes a transfer not permitted under rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I would like to address the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, what I heard is my amendment may not be in accordance with the rule; but I know one thing, it's in accordance with what we need in this country.

We need to take a share of that money that we are spending in Afghanistan to secure those people to secure our people here back home. That money that you say is not being spent, give it to me. The city of Detroit, we'll spend that money. We need the police officers, the firefighters, the emergency medical providers and radios to talk to each other.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I will do so, Mr. Chair, and to that end, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and will offer separate legislation to protect the American people. We need to redirect that money from Afghanistan and bring it back home. Our people need it. It is our money in the first place.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, beginning at line 14, strike "Provided further, That funds provided under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604) shall only be provided to the top 10 highest risk urban areas:".

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is remove the restriction that the Urban Areas Security Initiative funding should be restricted to the top 10 urban areas by risk. You see, there are other metropolitan areas in this country that I believe are at similar or even higher risk of terrorist attack or damage through any other type of catastrophe.

The metro Detroit area is one of those. That area, the area that I represent, has the busiest border crossing in all of North America and has an international airport. It has a huge metropolitan population center. It has the world headquarters of General Motors. We are at high risk of an attack; but yet right now, according to the Homeland Security risk metrics, we are not rated in the top 10. We should be eligible for this funding, as well as other metropolitan areas.

Here's the point: even though bin Laden is now gone, we are still at risk of a terrorist attack in this country. But it is more than likely that terrorists will likely come from within the borders. So the first defense we have against terrorism or any other natural disaster is our first responders. We need more firefighters, more police officers, more emergency medical providers. They need to be properly trained and have the equipment, the radios and communication devices to communicate with each other.

The best way to protect our citizens, it is not spending it only overseas, all of our tax dollars, but investing it right here at home. This amendment will make sure that urban areas that are at high risk of an attack, such as metro Detroit, get the funds that they need.

The bottom line point is this: the reason we should step in and support our local units of government is because this Congress in the past did not effectively address the foreclosure crisis which has really robbed local units of government of their power to fund their first responders. The property values have dropped so low the money isn't even there.

I am asking Congress now: don't turn your back on this obligation to the

American people. Let's redirect money to the Homeland Security budget, to our first responders, our people there at the first line of defense against an attack from a terrorist or any type of natural disaster that could impact our people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this committee's support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1940

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation on the point of order, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. The bill before us today is born out of the need for reform. It consolidates disparate grant programs and provides discretion to the Secretary. These reforms include funding reductions, requirements for measurement, and requirements for spending languishing dollars.

The consolidation of this bill forces the Secretary to examine the intelligence and risk and put scarce dollars where they're needed most, whether it's a port, rail, surveillance, or access and hardening of projects, or whether it is to high-risk urban areas or to States, as opposed to reverse engineering projects to fill the amount designated for many programs or granting funds to lower risk.

Additionally, as noted by the gentleman, the bill limits Urban Area Security Initiative grants to the top 10 highest cities. Again, this puts scarce dollars to where they are needed most. That means that cities like New York are funded at significantly higher levels than other cities because they are the highest-rent urban areas. I don't think anyone here can argue with that. This does not mean lower-risk areas will lose all funding. It just means that funds will come from other programs such as State homeland grants that are risk and formula based.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline by aligning funding with the areas of highest risk and vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, our amendment would enhance public safety in communities across the country by striking the provision in the bill that would limit participation in the Urban Area Security Initiative program to just 10 cities.

Homeland Security Secretary Napolitano has said that the architecture of homeland security begins in the homeland. The Urban Area Security Initiative program protects the hometown by allowing first responders and emergency officials to practice coordinating response scenarios across jurisdictional lines. Until recently, the pro-

gram supported these crucial activities in 64 communities, including my own, judged by the Department of Homeland Security to be vulnerable to terrorist attack. That was until we decimated the program by cutting 20 percent of its funding in the continuing resolution.

Rather than allow all communities to suffer cuts proportionately, the Department made matters worse by deciding to eliminate half of the 64 communities from the program, including all four communities in upstate New York. Let us not make a third mistake this year by limiting participation in this important program to even fewer urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, my community of western New York includes four international bridge crossings and the busiest passenger crossing at the northern border; the largest electricity producer in New York State; and the homegrown al Qaeda terrorist cell, the Lackawanna Six. It sits along two Great Lakes which contain the largest freshwater supply in the world, and it is within a 500-mile radius of 55 percent of the American population and 62 percent of the Canadian population.

For 8 years the Department evaluated western New York to be a highly vulnerable area and thus eligible for the Urban Area Security Initiative. Now, this year the Department wants to eliminate us from the program, and this bill would codify that decision. Why? What has changed? We are still vulnerable, according to the Department's own assessment, and we will still need the resources to prevent and respond to attacks.

Mr. Chairman, this body should not prevent my community, or the other 54 communities the Department has judged to be vulnerable, from this essential Homeland Security program. I oppose this provision of the bill, and I urge adoption of our amendment.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I would like to thank the cosponsors of this amendment: Representatives BERKLEY, TONKO, ELLISON, MOORE, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, CAPPS, SLAUGHTER, CUELLAR, FUDGE, and WILSON.

Now I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Higgins amendment to eliminate a provision in this bill that would harm Las Vegas, Phoenix, Denver, Miami, Atlanta, Baltimore, Detroit, and dozens more cities around the country.

This bill before us would eliminate any funding for the Urban Area Security Initiative for all but the top 10 highest-risk urban areas, leaving over 50 U.S. cities off the list, including my own city of Las Vegas, one of the greatest tourist destinations in the world with over 37 million visitors a year.

For almost a decade, the UASI program has worked to help cities prevent and protect themselves from threats

and acts of terrorism. Not too long ago, over 60 U.S. cities received funding to help them purchase equipment, develop recovery plans, and implement counterterrorism strategies.

In my home city of Las Vegas, for example, we've created the Southern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center, where 18 State, local, and Federal agencies all work together to detect and prevent terrorists and other homeland security-related events. This kind of fusion center is based on the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to help law enforcement agencies communicate more effectively so they can put the pieces together that could prevent attacks. UASI funding has been an essential part of that center, and cutting off funding to that center now would put their excellent and possibly lifesaving work at risk.

Southern Nevada is home to Nellis Air Force Base and Hoover Dam and some of the largest hotels on the planet. We know that some of the 9/11 terrorists visited Las Vegas before the horrific attack on our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, after the capture and killing of Osama bin Laden, we also know that terrorists are increasingly focusing their interests on mid-sized cities rather than large cities. Many of those would now not be receiving Federal funding were this provision to become law. This is being done when the risk of retaliation by both homegrown terrorists and al Qaeda and al Qaeda affiliates is very high. I implore my colleagues not to leave some of America's greatest cities vulnerable and without the necessary funding to protect themselves.

At a time when States and local governments are struggling to balance their budgets, we need help more than ever to prevent and prepare against terrorist attacks. This provision would be salt to the wounds.

I urge support for this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

While I have serious misgivings about the funding levels for FEMA first responder grants, restoration of the Urban Area Security Initiative to its intended purpose is good policy. By limiting UASI recipients to the 10 highest-risk cities, Chairman ADERHOLT would ensure that UASI is focused on addressing the unique planning, equipment, and training needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas in order to prevent, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism against the highest-risk American targets.

Originally distributed to seven metropolitan areas, UASI ballooned to 64 regions in FY10, many of which were neither high threat nor high density. By increasing the number of UASI recipients without additional funding,

this amendment would deplete resources for cities most at risk for terrorist attacks.

□ 1950

With intelligence about intent to attack the United States around the 10th anniversary of September 11—which is fast approaching—now is the time to focus our resources where they are most needed, not spread the wealth.

Every region, however—I want to make it clear to my colleague—every region is entitled to Federal security resources, and that's why the State Homeland Security Grant program provides funding to each State and territory. However, in addition, Congress has the responsibility to allocate funding to address unique needs, and UASI was intentionally designed to protect those densely populated areas most at risk.

The 9/11 Commission said it best, "Federal Homeland Security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue sharing; it should supplement State and local resources based on the risks or vulnerabilities that merit additional support. Congress should not use this money as a pork barrel."

I want to make a couple of other points, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment for the following reasons. For example, based on projections recently released by FEMA for FY 2011, New York State will receive more than \$141 million in DHS funds separate from UASI. Buffalo will be one of five cities in New York to receive funding from the Metropolitan Medical Response System; that's \$1.4 million for these cities. Further, Buffalo is scheduled to receive more than \$1.4 million from the Port Security Grant program. In FY 2010, Erie County also received \$940,000 from the Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant program, a program which I had a little bit to do to create. Lastly, the Robert Moses Power Plant was previously awarded a buffer zone protection grant in FY 2007, only 58 percent of which has been spent.

So I want to make it very clear—I can go on. Michigan got \$21,468,166, and we have a whole list of what other cities have gotten and States because they deserve that money. Every State, region, and community is entitled to Federal resources for homeland security. However, UASI was a program that was not intended to spread the wealth among every region. And other DHS initiatives better address the needs of most areas of the country.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague regarding the Urban Area Security Initiative.

As New Yorkers, we know firsthand the absolutely critical role that our State and local police and firefighters play in preventing and responding to attacks on the American homeland. The Urban Area Security Initiative, or UASI, administered by the Department of Homeland Security, is a program focused on enhancing regional preparedness in high-risk areas by fostering better communication and collaboration amongst local fire responders. Given the struggles we have faced since the crisis on Wall Street, these are communities that increasingly cannot afford to provide their citizens—our citizens—with the same level of protection that UASI enables.

This bill, as written, arbitrarily restricts UASI to allow only 10 urban areas to be eligible for the program, and its funding, down from more than 60 in previous years. No one here today would argue that Manhattan and Los Angeles are undeserving of priority assistance. However, with this arbitrary cap, we will endanger the progress that many other high-risk urban areas have made to protect our citizens from attacks and crises. We will threaten the ability of these communities—including my community in upstate New York—to safeguard our citizens.

We are making these cuts at home while we pay hundreds of billions of dollars each year for our military-industrial complex to fight an incredibly expensive war in Afghanistan with the aim of preventing terror attacks in America. We are going to spend more than \$12 billion this year to build up Afghan security forces while our own security forces in Albany and the Capital Region and 50 other cities across America are stripped of their funding under UASI. Is our strategic thinking that backwards, or is it just more lucrative to build a multibillion-dollar army halfway around the world than to help our police and firefighters here at home protect and defend our constituents?

I would propose to take \$1 billion of that \$12 billion and put it back into a deserving and necessary program like UASI, but according to the rules set by the Republican leadership, that is not allowed. So I stand here today in support of this amendment and in support of New York.

In my home district in upstate New York, the Albany Urban Area Working Group has used UASI grants to make great strides forward in boosting local cooperation and collaborative planning. This group unites participants from Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady, and Schoharie Counties around a common goal of protecting a region critical to the security of New York State and the stability of America.

From building a truly interoperable regional communications network to securing the Capital Region's critical infrastructure, the work of this group is absolutely vital to protecting the Empire State. Whether threatened by

natural or manmade disasters, it is clear that New York is and should be at the top of our priority list to protect.

I represent New York's Capital Region, an area that bears tremendous economic and symbolic importance. Thirty-five million people live within a 200-mile radius of our State capital in Albany. Albany also houses New York's most vital State government facilities and more than 11,000 State government employees that keep the Empire State up and running. These functions are vital not only to our area, but also to our fellow New Yorkers downstate and across our State, and to Americans across this country who do business in, with, and through New York.

The Capital Region is also home to the third-fastest-growing hub for science and technology jobs in our Nation. That projected clustering, alongside high-profile research and development centers in our Tech Valley corridor, add to the vital importance of this region to an American economy that needs more leaders in innovation.

In Albany, we host the world-renowned Nanotechnology Research Center where 250 industry leaders partner with the United States Army to push us past the current bounds of science. In Schenectady, we host GE's renewable energy global headquarters. In Schoharie, our reservoir provides a significant portion of New York City's water supply. In Watervliet, we have a one-of-a-kind Army arsenal. And just a few miles away we host an atomic power laboratory doing world class R&D for the United States Naval Nuclear Propulsion program. Nearby in Malta is a facility that will soon be the most advanced chip fabrication plant in the world. The hometown heroes who protect all of these facilities and more will lose their funding through UASI entirely if this bill passes in its current form.

And so in support of New York's Capital Region and similar areas across this country, I stand in support of this amendment, this amendment that will remove an arbitrary 10-city restriction on the UASI program from this bill, this amendment, that will not add \$1 to the debt or deficit, this amendment that will not cost us one single dollar but rather will provide us a common-sense approach.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

I represent Columbus, Ohio, which in the past has been one of the Tier II cities that has received Urban Security Initiative funds. The current version of this bill would restrict Urban Security Initiative funds to only Tier I cities, which would be the top 10 riskiest cities. The problem is the risks don't stop

at number 10, and it's not clear that there is any significant reduction in risk between the tenth-riskiest city and the 11th-riskiest city. This is an arbitrary decision, and the Clarke amendment ends the arbitrary 10-city restriction and allows the Department of Homeland Security to have discretion in funding risks. It does not increase funding one cent.

I urge adoption of the Clarke amendment. And I would just like to make it clear that the whole point of this amendment is to remove an arbitrary restriction and give the Department of Homeland Security the ability to fund where the risks are. This amendment does not add a dime to the cost. It increases flexibility. And it won't necessarily cost cities like New York or any other city any funds. All it does is

allow cities to be eligible so that if there is real risk there and the Department of Homeland Security chooses to fund that city, then they can fund it. So it's a commonsense approach.

I ask my colleagues to support the Clarke approach.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague regarding UASI.

This amendment will better ensure that all cities and localities will be eligible for critical UASI funding, not just those under the arbitrary caps that are in the underlying bill.

UASI funding is critical to my district of Sacramento, California, and a number of other major American cities. It has helped create and develop one of the Nation's foremost counterterrorism and readiness task forces located at the former McClellan Air Force Base in my district. This facility has greatly enhanced the collaboration and communication amongst local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies and first responders. From there, officials are better able to prevent attacks by training, sharing information, and coordinating investigations. And in the unthinkable scenario in which an attack does occur, this facility, funded by UASI dollars, will better able the region's law enforcement and first responders to react and respond to an attack.

## NOTICE

*Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.*

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1745. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0938; FRL-8872-6] received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1746. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-1009; FRL-8873-2] received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1747. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0755; FRL-8872-7] received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1748. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2011 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency's current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix, in accordance with section 1206 of the Financial Institutions, Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1749. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Acquisition of Commercial Items (DFARS Case 2008-D011) (RIN: 0750-AG23) received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1750. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Ac-

quisition Regulations Supplement; Rules of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1751. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Consumer Leasing [Regulation M; Docket No.: R-1400] (RIN: No. 7100-AD60) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1752. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No.: R-1399] (RIN: No. 7100-AD59) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Understandings Reached at the 2010 Australia Group (AG) Plenary Meeting and Other AG-Related Clarifications and Corrections to the EAR [Docket No.: 110106012-1013-01] (RIN: 0694-AF04) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1754. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1181] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1755. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1191] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1756. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting written notification of the determination that a public health emergency exists and has existed in the state of North Dakota since April 5, 2011, pursuant to 42 U.S.C.

247d(a) Public Law 107-188, section 144(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Large Appliance Coatings [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0142; FRL-9304-2] received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of the Significant New Uses of 2-Propen-1-one, 1-(4-morpholinyl)— [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0669; FRL-8871-5] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, California Air Resources Board — Consumer Products [EPA-R09-2010-0906; FRL-9278-9] received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1760. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Modifications; Submission Period Suspension [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0187; FRL-8874-2] (RIN: 2070-AJ43) received May 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1761. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Notification of the intention to exercise the authority under Section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize the drawdown to support efforts to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas under threat of attack in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1762. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter regarding the United States involvement in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1763. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to

Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act (No FEAR Act), the Department's annual report for FY 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1764. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Bycatch Reduction in the Gulf of Mexico Pelagic Longline Fishery [Docket No.: 101029546-1208-02] (RIN: 0648-BA39) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1765. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA337) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1766. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Annual Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 100201058-0260-02] (RIN: 0648-XA333) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1767. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Octopus in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA322) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1768. A letter from the Auditor, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the annual financial report of the Society for calendar year 2010, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(19) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1769. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2010, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(f); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1770. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 118 Clean Coal (Rev. Proc. 2011-30) received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1771. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — User Fees Relating to Enrolled Agents and Enrolled Retirement Plan Agents [TD 9523] (RIN: 1545-BJ65) received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1772. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting eight legislative proposals to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2012; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, Education and the Workforce, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Veterans' Affairs, Small Business, House Administration, Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Budget.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Suballocation of the Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2012 (Rept. 112-96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-97). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1249. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform; with an amendment (Rept. 112-98, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1249 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2065. A bill to permit the expungement of records of certain non-violent criminal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2067. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for hurricane and tornado mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2068. A bill to permit a Commissioner of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to continue to serve on the Commission if a successor is not timely appointed and confirmed; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 2069. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to enhance existing programs providing mitigation assistance by encour-

aging States to adopt and actively enforce State building codes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2070. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the nation on June 6, 1944, the morning of D-Day; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 2071. A bill to provide for duty-free treatment of certain recreational performance outerwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2072. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 2073. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to implement country-of-origin disclosure requirements with respect to motor vehicle fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BUERKLE (for herself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2074. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require a comprehensive policy on reporting and tracking sexual assault incidents and other safety incidents that occur at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2075. A bill to require that spent nuclear fuel be stored in certified dry cask storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the statutory authority for the longstanding practice of the Department of Justice of providing investigatory assistance on request of State and local authorities with respect to certain serious violent crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 2077. A bill to repeal medical loss ratio requirements for health insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for greater notification of flood insurance rate map changes and the appeals process, extensions of the appeals process, reimbursement for successful map change petitions outside of the standard appeals process, and removal of certain properties from flood insurance rate maps; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 2079. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the "John J. Cook Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals either a credit against income tax or a deduction for expenses paid or incurred by reason of a voluntary or mandatory evacuation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to replace the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2083. A bill to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WEST, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President is in violation of the War Powers Resolution regarding the use of United States Armed Forces in Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H. Res. 289. A resolution recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 290. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that it is imperative that the United States creates a clear vision and goal to be the world leader in innovation, science, technology, engineering, and math to ensure the continued strength, growth, and vitality of this Nation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H. Res. 291. A resolution urging the expedient relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

43. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution H.P. 1034 urging the Congress and the Secretary of Education to continue to rely on formula allocations that recognize the obligation to educate all our children regardless of where they live; to

the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

44. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4016 recognizing the importance of public awareness of multiple sclerosis and proclaiming the week of March 14-20, 2011, "MS Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

45. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 40 recognizing the many contributions of the thousands of volunteers and paid staff at pregnancy care centers in West Virginia and across the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

46. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution 6025 supporting continued jurisdiction of the states to conserve and properly regulate oil and gas production; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

47. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Memorial 46 requesting the federal government to take steps to ensure the rights of property owners in New Mexico and neighboring states are protected; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

48. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution 270 expressing serious concern about the scope, justification, and substance of the OSMRE's stream protection rule; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

49. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Resolution 60 opposing any reduction of funding for the National Fish Hatchery Operations that would result in the closing of the Erwin National Fish Hatchery; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

50. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3048 urging the Congress to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

51. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 urging the Congress to enact the Unemployment Insurance Solvency Act of 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

52. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 264 commending the United States military and other involved United States intelligence and strategic agencies for their service in this near decade-long manhunt for Osama bin Laden; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have the Power . . . To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and offenses against the Law of Nations;

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 2066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 2068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 2069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 1, clause 18 and pursuant to Article I, section 8, clause 18 and of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 2073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BUERKLE:

H.R. 2074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 2076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The repeal of this provision is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 2079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by sixteenth amendment which, by granting Congress the power to lay and collect taxes allows Congress to provide tax relief to Americans forced to leave their homes because of a natural disaster.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce amongst the several states.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudiced any Claims of the United States, or any other particular State.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. REICHERT.  
H.R. 25: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H.R. 31: Mr. CANSECO.  
H.R. 85: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 91: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
H.R. 153: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 177: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
H.R. 190: Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 198: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
H.R. 303: Mr. KISSELL.  
H.R. 320: Mr. KISSELL.  
H.R. 365: Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 409: Mr. KISSELL.  
H.R. 436: Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
H.R. 451: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 520: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. CAPPS.  
H.R. 605: Mr. WEST, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 640: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Ms. FUDGE.  
H.R. 642: Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 706: Mr. HINCHEY.  
H.R. 709: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 721: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. RICHARDSON.  
H.R. 733: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 735: Mr. FLAKE.  
H.R. 740: Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 757: Mr. HIMES.  
H.R. 808: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 883: Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 886: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 894: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
H.R. 900: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
H.R. 904: Mr. RUNYAN.  
H.R. 973: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.  
H.R. 992: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 1006: Mr. DEUTCH and Mrs. SCHMIDT.  
H.R. 1028: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 1044: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 1057: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 1058: Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
H.R. 1063: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 1084: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 1121: Mr. ROSS of Florida.  
H.R. 1149: Mr. HANABUSA.  
H.R. 1172: Ms. FUDGE.  
H.R. 1174: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 1193: Mr. CICILLINE.  
H.R. 1206: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. CANSECO.  
H.R. 1218: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. REED.  
H.R. 1227: Mr. CANSECO.  
H.R. 1236: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WU, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 1259: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
H.R. 1269: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 1277: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 1284: Mr. SABLON, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 1311: Ms. FUDGE.  
H.R. 1327: Mr. CASSIDY.  
H.R. 1328: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
H.R. 1331: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.  
H.R. 1351: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. INSLEE.  
H.R. 1379: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
H.R. 1426: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 1488: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 1498: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 1501: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1505: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FLEMING, and Mrs. ELLMERS.  
H.R. 1506: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 1514: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 1515: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 1533: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 1545: Mr. HALL.  
H.R. 1547: Mr. CICILLINE.  
H.R. 1558: Mr. FLORES.  
H.R. 1574: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 1585: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
H.R. 1592: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 1625: Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 1629: Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 1633: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 1639: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. YODER.  
H.R. 1666: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 1672: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 1683: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1687: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 1694: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H.R. 1706: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 1723: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 1724: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. BERKLEY.  
H.R. 1734: Mr. LANDRY and Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 1735: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH.  
H.R. 1744: Mr. LANDRY, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.  
H.R. 1748: Mr. OLVER.  
H.R. 1756: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 1775: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 1791: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.  
H.R. 1796: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WU, and Mr. KUCINICH.  
H.R. 1799: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mrs. MALONEY.  
H.R. 1803: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 1815: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, and Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 1848: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. LANDRY.  
H.R. 1852: Mr. TERRY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 1856: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
H.R. 1861: Mr. MCKINLEY.  
H.R. 1872: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. SCHOCK.  
H.R. 1873: Mr. INSLEE.  
H.R. 1878: Mr. KUCINICH.  
H.R. 1932: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. MARCHANT.  
H.R. 1938: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. HUELSKAMP.  
H.R. 1941: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 1946: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 1964: Mr. SCHOCK.  
H.R. 1970: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
H.R. 1976: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HURT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CANSECO,

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1980: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 1987: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 1997: Mr. ROSS of Florida.  
H.R. 2000: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 2008: Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 2010: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 2023: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 2026: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2033: Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 2040: Mr. MARCHANT.  
H.R. 2061: Ms. NORTON, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REYES, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2063: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. MOORE.  
H.J. Res. 62: Mr. LABRADOR.  
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. WEST.  
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H. Res. 19: Mr. RANGEL.  
H. Res. 20: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H. Res. 34: Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 137: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 156: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
H. Res. 157: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
H. Res. 177: Mrs. MYRICK.  
H. Res. 220: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CASSIDY.

H. Res. 226: Mr. ROSS of Florida.  
H. Res. 266: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 267: Mr. HUELSKAMP.  
H. Res. 283: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 11R-03-41 requesting affirmative action to at least maintain the present level of funding for the community development block grant; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6. Also, a petition of City of Atlanta, Georgia, relative to Resolution 11-R-0768 supporting the deepening of the port of the Savannah River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7. Also, a petition of the Niagara County Legislature, New York, relative to Resolution No. IL-030-11 declaring opposition to H.R. 1555; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

8. Also, a petition of State Lands Commission, California, relative to Resolution supporting the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2011; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, and Agriculture.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. SPEIER

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to award a follow-on contract to a sole-source contract awarded

noncompetitively on the basis of urgency unless the Department has developed a competitive acquisition strategy containing a plan to obtain competition following completion of the sole-source contract.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. SPEIER

AMENDMENT No. 16: Page 88, line 21, after "that" insert "(1)".

Page 88, line 23, before the period insert "; and (2) the image retention capabilities of all deployed advanced imaging technology utilized by the Transportation Security Administration to screen passengers and crews at checkpoints in airports in the United States have been disabled".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. SPEIER

AMENDMENT No. 17: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or to make a grant to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. SPEIER

AMENDMENT No. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award a non-competitively bid contract to an Alaska Native Corporation, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian Organization in an amount in excess of the competitive bidding threshold.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. SPEIER

AMENDMENT No. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Transportation Security Administration to purchase clothing that is not 100 percent domestic in origin.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance the use of Federal Air Marshals on inbound international flights considered to be high risk by the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIS

AMENDMENT No. 21: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to detain any alien pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States, or an alien ordered removed, if the alien has never been charged with a felony in the United States.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIS

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 17, beginning on line 10, strike "of which not less than \$5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g));".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIS

AMENDMENT No. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)).

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. BARLETTA

AMENDMENT No. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act for "U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses" for official reception and representation expenses shall be available until every deportable alien convicted of a crime in the United States has been removed from the United States.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

AMENDMENT No. 25: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 21, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. DENT

AMENDMENT No. 26: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$63,000,000)".

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$112,000,000)".

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$175,000,000)".

Page 50, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$62,500,000)".

Page 50, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$112,500,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CRAVAACK

AMENDMENT No. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)).

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. BARROW

AMENDMENT No. 28: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CHAFFETZ

AMENDMENT No. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to operate or maintain existing advanced imaging technology machines as mandatory or primary screening devices.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CHAFFETZ

AMENDMENT No. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to purchase new advanced imaging technology machines.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 31: Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 32: Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to delay compliance with title II of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note) beyond the January 15, 2013, deadline.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of Public Law 111-148, Public Law 111-152, or any amendment made by either of such laws.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to administer the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, with respect to any project or program funded by this Act.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 36: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be made available to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, Acorn Beneficial Assoc., Inc., Arkansas Broadcast Foundation, Inc., Acorn Children's Beneficial Assoc., Arkansas Community Housing Corp., Acorn Community Land Assoc., Inc., Acorn Community Land Assoc. of Illinois, Acorn Community Land Association of Louisiana, Acorn Community Land Assoc. of Pennsylvania, ACORN COMMUNITY LABOR ORGANIZING CENTER, ACORN Beverly LLC, ACORN Canada, ACORN Center for Housing, ACORN Housing Affordable Loans LLC, Acorn Housing 1 Associates, LP, Acorn Housing 2 Associates, LP, ACORN Housing 3 Associates LP, ACORN Housing 4 Associates, L.P., ACORN International, ACORN VOTES, Acorn 2004 Housing Development Fund Corporation, ACRMW, ACSI, Acorn Cultural Trust, Inc., American Environmental Justice Project, Inc., ACORN Fund, Inc., Acorn Fair Housing Organization, Inc., Acorn Foster Parents, Inc., Agape Broadcast Foundation Inc., Acorn Housing Corporation, Arkansas Acorn Housing Corporation, Acorn Housing Corp. of Arizona, Acorn Housing Corp. of Illinois, Acorn Housing Corp. of Missouri, New Jersey ACORN Housing Corporation, Inc., AHCNY, Acorn Housing Corp. of Pennsylvania, Texas ACORN Housing Corporation, Inc., American Institute for Social Justice, Acorn law for Education, Rep. & Training, Acorn Law Reform Pac, Affiliated Media Foundation Movement, Albuquerque Minimum Wage Committee, Acorn National Broadcasting Network, Arkansas New Party, Arkansas Acorn Political Action Committee, Association for Rights of Citizens, Acorn Services, Inc., Acorn Television in Action for Communities, Acorn Tenants' Union, Inc., Acorn Tenant Union Training & Org. Project, AWA, Bronx Organizing Support Center, Inc., Bronx Parent Leadership, Baton Rouge ACORN Education Project, Inc., Baton Rouge Assoc. of School Employees, Broad Street Corporation, California Acorn Political Action Committee, Citizens Action Research Project, Council Beneficial Association, Citizens Campaign for Fair Work, Living Wage Etc., Citizens Consulting, Inc., California Community Network, Citizens for April Troope, Clean Government Pac, Chicago Organizing and Support Center, Inc., Council Health Plan, Citizens Services Soci-

ety, Campaign For Justice at Avondale, CLOC, Community and Labor for Baltimore, Chief Organizer Fund, Colorado Organizing and Support Center, Community Real Estate Processing, Inc., Campaign to Reward Work, Citizens Services Incorporated, Elysian Fields Corporation, Environmental Justice Training Project, Inc., Franklin Acorn Housing Corporation, Flagstaff Broadcast Foundation, Floridians for All PAC, Fifteenth Street Corporation, Friends of Wendy Foy, Greenwell Springs Corporations, Genevieve Stewart Campaign Fund, Hammurabi Fund, Houston Organizing Support Center, Hospitality Hotel and Restaurant Org. Council, Iowa ACORN Broadcasting Corp., Illinois Home Day Care Workers Association, Inc., Illinois Acorn Political Action Committee, Illinois New Party, Illinois New Party Political Committee, Institute for Worker Education, Inc., Jefferson Association of Parish Employees, Jefferson Association of School Employees, Johnnie Pugh Campaign Fund, Louisiana ACORN, New York Communities for Change, Affordable Housing Centers of America, Action Now, Pennsylvania Communities Organizing for Change, Arkansas Community Organizations (ACO), The Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment, New England United for Justice, Texas Organizing Project, Minnesota, Neighborhoods Organizing for Change, Organization United for Reform, Missourians Organizing for Reform and Empowerment, A Community Voice, Community Organizations International, Applied Research Center, or the Working Families Party.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CICILLINE

AMENDMENT No. 37: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$336,000,000)".

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$337,000,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT No. 38: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$6,335,000)".

Page 92, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$6,335,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

AMENDMENT No. 39: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the requirements in—

(1) section 34(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229(a)(1)(A));

(2) section 34(a)(1)(B) of such Act;

(3) section 34(c)(1) of such Act;

(4) section 34(c)(2) of such Act;

(5) section 34(c)(4)(A) of such Act; and

(6) section 34(a)(1)(E) of such Act.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. ROYCE

AMENDMENT No. 40: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 41: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO INTRODUCE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INTO HOSTILITIES OR OTHER SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES

SEC. 7XX. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available to carry out this Act

may be used to introduce United States Armed Forces—

(1) into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances,

(2) into the territory, airspace or waters of a foreign nation, while equipped for combat, except for deployments which relate solely to supply, replacement, repair, or training of such forces, or

(3) in numbers which substantially enlarge United States Armed Forces equipped for combat already located in a foreign nation, for a period longer than 60 days from the date a report is required to be submitted under section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543), unless Congress has declared war or has enacted a specific authorization for such use of the Armed Forces, has extended by law such 60-day period, or is physically unable to meet as a result of an armed attack upon the United States, as specified under section 5 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544).

(b) EXTENSION.—Such 60-day period shall be extended for not more than an additional 30 days if the President determines and certifies to the Congress in writing that unavoidable military necessity respecting the safety of United States Armed Forces requires the continued use of such Armed Forces in the course of bringing about a prompt removal of the Armed Forces.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

AMENDMENT No. 42: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. LATOURETTE

AMENDMENT No. 43: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$63,350,000".

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$117,470,000".

Page 4, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$139,180,000".

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$55,672,000".

Page 4, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$83,508,000".

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$320,000,000".

Page 50, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$135,000,000".

Page 50, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$185,000,000".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MRS. LOWEY

AMENDMENT No. 44: Page 50, line 9, before the period insert "Provided further, That an additional \$1,229,500,000 is available for State and Local Programs with this amount designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress)."

Page 51, line 5, before the period insert "Provided further, That an additional \$460,000,000 is available for Firefighter Assistance Grants with this amount designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress)."

Page 91, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000,000);".

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT No. 45: At the end of the bill (before any short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with or to make a grant

to any corporation for which any unpaid Federal tax liability has been assessed, all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and such liability is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting such liability.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT No. 46: At the end of the bill (before any short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with or to make a grant to any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. ROKITA

AMENDMENT No. 47: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the determination of the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration regarding transportation security officers and collective bargaining as described in the decision memorandum dated February 4, 2011.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. ROKITA

AMENDMENT No. 48: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for official receptions or representations.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. JORDAN

AMENDMENT No. 49: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law, amounts made available for U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and amounts made available for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement) is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 50: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any damage award or civil compensation to any person who has obtained a judgment against the United States for any act or omission by the Department of Homeland Security agency or an employee of such department if the claimant is not a citizen of the United States.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 51: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to comply with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, popularly known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. GOODLATTE

AMENDMENT No. 52: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare for the fiscal year 2012 allotment of diversity immigrant visas under section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(c)).

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT No. 53: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$50,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT No. 54: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 47, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT No. 55: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT No. 56: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT No. 57: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT No. 58: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT No. 59: Page 47, line 10, after “heading” insert the following: “at least \$10,000,000 shall be for Buffer Zone Protection Plan Grants, \$50,000,000 shall be for Port Security Grants, \$100,000,000 shall be for public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, \$50,000,000 shall be for interoperable emergency communications, \$42,337,000 shall be for the Metropolitan Medical Response System.”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT No. 60: Page 47, line 10, after “Stonegarden” insert “, \$50,000,000 shall be for Interoperable Emergency Operations Grants,”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT No. 61: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, “insert (reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 53, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 62: Page 12, line 17, insert the following after “technology”: “: *Provided*

further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$50,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 102 of the Illegal Immigration and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CUELLAR

AMENDMENT No. 63: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 14, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$32,000,000)”.

Page 63, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT No. 64: Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$50,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. SCALISE

AMENDMENT No. 65: Page 25, line 7, insert before the period “: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to require an approved Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) applicant to personally appear at a designated enrollment center for the purpose of TWIC issuance, renewal, or activation.”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. SCALISE

AMENDMENT No. 66: Page 47, line 14, strike “*Provided further*” and all that follows through “urban areas:” on line 17.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. SCALISE

AMENDMENT No. 67: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce Executive Order 13502, the FAR Council supporting regulations FAR Rule 2009-005, or any agency memorandum, bulletin, or contracting policy that derives its authority from Executive Order 13502 or FAR Rule 2009-005.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. BARROW

AMENDMENT No. 68: Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT No. 69: Page 47, beginning at line 14, strike “*Provided further*, That funds provided under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604) shall only be provided to the top 10 highest risk urban areas:”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT No. 70: Page 45, after “\$1,000,000,000,” insert “and in addition \$2,000,000,000 which is hereby transferred from unobligated amounts provided under the heading ‘Afghanistan Security Forces Fund’ under title IX of Public Law 112-10,”.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT No. 71: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any action by a political appointee (as that term is defined in section 106 of title 49, United States Code) to delay, vacate, or reverse any decision by an employee in the Privacy Office of the Department of Homeland Security to make

records available pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, popularly known as the Freedom of Information Act.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. SCALISE

AMENDMENT No. 72: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to require an approved Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) applicant to personally appear at a designated enrollment center for the purpose of TWIC issuance, renewal, or activation.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 73: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MRS. LUMMIS

AMENDMENT No. 74: Page 89, beginning at line 14, strike section 547.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. ALTMIRE

AMENDMENT No. 75: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

USE OF AMERICAN IRON, STEEL, AND  
MANUFACTURED GOODS

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the construction, modification,

maintenance, or repair of vehicle or pedestrian fencing along the southern border unless all of the iron, steel, and manufactured goods used in the construction, modification, maintenance, or repair are produced in the United States.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. GOHMERT

AMENDMENT No. 76: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the new construction, purchase, or lease of any building or space in the District of Columbia for any branch of the United States Government except if a contract for the construction, purchase, or lease was entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.